

Brill's Companion to Prequels, Sequels, and Retellings of Classical Epic

Brill's Companions to Classical Reception

Series Editor

Kyriakos N. Demetriou (*University of Cyprus*)

VOLUME 15

The titles published in this series are listed at *brill.com/bccr*

Brill's Companion to Prequels, Sequels, and Retellings of Classical Epic

Edited by

Robert Simms



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Cover illustration: Detail of the Amazon Frieze from the Mausoleum at Halicarnassus: combats between Greeks and Amazons. British Museum: online database, entry 460559.

© Marie-Lan Nguyen / Wikimedia Commons / CC-BY 2.5

Library of Congress Cataloging-in-Publication Data

Names: Simms, Robert, editor.

Title: Brill's companion to prequels, sequels, and retellings of classical epic / edited by Robert Simms.

Other titles: Companion to prequels, sequels, and retellings of classical epic

Description: Leiden ; Boston : Brill, 2018. | Series: Brill's companions to classical reception ; volume 15 | Includes bibliographical references and index.

Identifiers: LCCN 2018006319 (print) | LCCN 2018007031 (ebook) |

ISBN 9789004360921 (E-book) | ISBN 9789004249356 (hardback : alk. paper)

Subjects: LCSH: Classical literature--History and criticism. | Epic literature--History and criticism. | Classical literature--Adaptations--History and criticism. | Epic literature--Adaptations--History and criticism. | Literature--Classical influences.

Classification: LCC PA3003 (ebook) | LCC PA3003 .B75 2018 (print) |

DDC 880.09--dc23

LC record available at <https://lcn.loc.gov/2018006319>

Typeface for the Latin, Greek, and Cyrillic scripts: "Brill". See and download: brill.com/brill-typeface.

ISSN 2213-1426

ISBN 978-90-04-24935-6 (hardback)

ISBN 978-90-04-36092-1 (e-book)

Copyright 2018 by Koninklijke Brill nv, Leiden, The Netherlands.

Koninklijke Brill nv incorporates the imprints Brill, Brill Hes & De Graaf, Brill Nijhoff, Brill Rodopi, Brill Sense and Hotei Publishing.

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced, translated, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without prior written permission from the publisher.

Authorization to photocopy items for internal or personal use is granted by Koninklijke Brill nv provided that the appropriate fees are paid directly to The Copyright Clearance Center, 222 Rosewood Drive, Suite 910, Danvers, MA 01923, USA. Fees are subject to change.

This book is printed on acid-free paper and produced in a sustainable manner.

Contents

Notes on Contributors IX

Introduction 1

Robert Simms

PART 1

Trojan and Homeric Continuations

The *Odyssey* after the *Iliad*: Ties That Bind 9

Elizabeth Minchin

The *Ilias Latina* as a Roman Continuation of the *Iliad* 31

Reinhold F. Glei

Triphiodorus' *The Sack of Troy* and Colluthus' *The Rape of Helen*: A Sequel
and a Prequel from Late Antiquity 52

Orestis Karavas

Program and Poetics in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica* 71

Calum A. Maciver

Teaching Homer through (Annotated) Poetry: John Tzetzes' *Carmina*
Iliaca 90

Marta Cardin

Joseph of Exeter: Troy through Dictys and Dares 115

Francine Mora-Lebrun

Robert Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid*: Transtextual Tragedy 134

Nickolas A. Haydock

Trojan Pasts, Medieval Presents: Epic Continuation in Eleventh to
Thirteenth Century Genealogical Histories 154

Adam J. Goldwyn

Epic Continuation as Basis for Moral Education: The *Télémaque* of Fénelon 175

Jardar Lohne

Nikos Kazantzakis' *Odysseia*: The Epic Sequel in Modern Greek Poetry and Classical Reception 189

Martha Klironomos

Spinning a Thread of One's Own from Homer to Atwood 206

Buket Akgün

PART 2

Beyond Troy and Homer

Squaring the Epic Cycle: Ovid's Rewriting of the Epic Tradition in the *Metamorphoses* 227

Marie Louise von Glinski

Continuing the *Aeneid* in the First Century: Ovid's "Little *Aeneid*", Lucan's *Bellum Civile*, and Silius Italicus' *Punica* 248

Neil W. Bernstein

Vegio's *Supplement*: Classical Learning, Christian Readings 267

Anne Rogerson

Ending the *Argonautica*: Giovanni Battista Pio's *Argonautica-Supplement* (1519) 295

Emma Buckley

Redressing Caesar as Dido in Thomas May's Continuations of Lucan 316

Robert Simms

Thomas Ross' Translation and Continuation of Silius Italicus' *Punica* in the English Restoration 335

Antony Augoustakis

Epic Scotland: Wilkie, Macpherson and Other Homeric Efforts 357

Kristin Lindfield-Ott

Virgil Mentor: Ursula Le Guin's <i>Lavinia</i>	375
<i>Nickolas A. Haydock</i>	

Index	393
--------------	------------

Notes on Contributors

Buket Akgün

is Assistant Professor of English at Istanbul University, where she teaches courses on 18th-century English novel, Chaucer, Shakespeare adaptations and reception, fantasy fiction, graphic and visual narratives, mythology, witches and witchcraft in fiction among other topics. She has published on classical reception, art and literature, speculative fiction, and witches. Her current studies focus on historical, mythological, and literary reception in graphic and visual narratives.

Antony Augoustakis

is Professor of Classics and Langan Professorial Scholar at the University of Illinois (Urbana-Champaign, USA). He is the editor of *The Classical Journal*. He is the author of *Statius, Thebaid 8* (Oxford, 2016), *Motherhood and the Other: Fashioning Female Power in Flavian Epic* (Oxford, 2010) and *Plautus' Mercator* (Bryn Mawr, 2009). He has edited the *Oxford Readings in Flavian Epic* (Oxford, 2016), *Ritual and Religion in Flavian Epic* (Oxford, 2013), *Flavian Poetry and its Greek Past* (Leiden, 2014), and the *Brill Companion to Silius Italicus* (Leiden, 2010), and co-edited with Carole Newlands Statius' *Silvae and the Poetics of Intimacy* (Arethusa, 2007), with Ariana Traill the *Blackwell Companion to Terence* (Malden, MA, 2013), and with Monica Cyrino, *Spartacus: Reimagining an Icon on Screen* (Edinburgh, 2016). He is currently working, among other projects, on a monograph on *Death, Burial and Ritual in Flavian Epic* and two commentaries, on Silius Italicus' *Punica* 3 and ps.-Seneca's *Hercules Oetaeus*.

Neil W. Bernstein

is Professor in the Department of Classics and World Religions at Ohio University. He teaches courses on Latin language and literature, Roman civilization, classical mythology, and ancient epic and drama. He is the author of *Seneca: Hercules Furens* (Bloomsbury Companions to Greek and Roman Tragedy, London, 2017); *Silius Italicus, Punica 2. Edited with an Introduction, Translation, and Commentary* (Oxford, 2017); *Ethics, Identity, and Community in Later Roman Declamation* (Oxford, 2013); and *In the Image of the Ancestors: Narratives of Kinship in Flavian Epic* (Toronto, 2008). His current project is a translation of Silius Italicus' *Punica*, co-authored with Antony Augoustakis.

Emma Buckley

is Lecturer in Latin and Classical Studies at St Andrews. She is the editor (with Martin Dinter) of *A Companion to the Neronian Age* (Wiley-Blackwell, 2013) and has published articles on early imperial poetry and drama; the reception of Virgil, Ovid, Lucan and Seneca in early modern England; and on the university plays of William Gager and Matthew Gwinne. She is currently preparing (with Edward Paleit) a modern edition of Thomas May's 1627 *Pharsalia*.

Marta Cardin

was trained in Greek Philology at Ca' Foscari University (Venice) and at the Scuola Normale Superiore (Pisa); she has held research grants from Ca' Foscari and from the Fondazione Giorgio Pasquali (Pisa), and has been a researcher in the national research program "Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, Aeschylus: forms and transmission of the ancient exegesis" ("FIRB", 2014–2016). She has published papers on fragmentary Hesiodic poetry and its transmission, and is currently working on a new critical edition of John Tzetzes' commentary to Hesiod's *Works and Days*.

Reinhold F. Glei

studied classical and medieval Latin and Greek at Cologne University, Germany, where he gained his PhD in 1983 with a dissertation on the Pseudo-Homeric *Batrachomyomachia*. After being a Research Assistant at Ruhr-University Bochum, in 1993 he was appointed Full Professor at the University of Bielefeld. In 1996, he returned to Bochum, where he holds the chair of Latin Philology. Special fields of interest are Neo-Latin literature, secondary literary forms (parody, supplements, centos), and the reception of Islam in the Latin West.

Marie Louise von Glinski

is the author of *Simile and Identity in Ovid's Metamorphoses* (Cambridge University Press, 2012). Her main research interest lies in Latin poetry, especially Ovid and Seneca, figurative language and intertextuality, and the creation of fictional worlds.

Adam J. Goldwyn

is Assistant Professor of Medieval Literature and English at North Dakota State University. He is the editor of *The Trojan Wars and the Making of the Modern World* (Uppsala, 2015) and *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Classics in International Modernism and the Avant-Garde* (Brill, 2017). With Dimitra Kokkini, he is translator of the twelfth-century Byzantine grammarian John Tzetzes'

Allegories of the Iliad (Harvard UP, 2015) and the forthcoming *Allegories of the Odyssey* (Harvard UP, 2019). His monograph *Byzantine Ecocriticism: Women, Nature, and Power in the Medieval Greek Romance* was published in Palgrave-MacMillan's New Middles Ages Series in 2018.

Nickolas A. Haydock

is a professor of English at the University of Puerto Rico, Mayagüez Campus. He is the author of *Situational Poetics in Robert Henryson's 'Testament of Cresseid'* (2010), *Movie Medievalism: The Imaginary Middle Ages* (2008), and (with E.L. Ridsen) *Beowulf on Film: Adaptations and Variations* (2013). He also serves as the series editor for Cambria Studies in Classicism, Orientalism and Medievalism.

Orestis Karavas

(PhD Université de Strasbourg, France) is currently Assistant Professor at the University of the Peloponnese (Kalamata, Greece). His main research interests are in Lucian and his contemporaries, the literature and religion of the Imperial age, and classical and post-classical drama. He is the author of *Lucien et la tragédie* (DeGruyter, 2005) and of several papers on Lucian. He has recently completed a commentary of Colluthus' *Rape of Helen*.

Martha Klironomos

is Professor of Modern Greek Studies and English at San Francisco State University where she has been teaching since 1996. Her research areas include Greek and Anglo-American modernism, twentieth-century British and American travel writing to Greece and contemporary Greek American literature. She is working on a book-length study on memory and classical reception in the work of the Greek Nobel Laureate George Seferis (forthcoming, Bloomsbury Academic).

Kristin Lindfield-Ott

is Programme Leader for Literature at the University of the Highlands and Islands. Her research focuses on eighteenth-century Scotland, but she is also interested in the interconnections between place and literature in other periods. She has published on Scottish literary tourism, Ossian, Jules Verne and Michel Faber, and is currently working on her first monograph *Macpherson the Historian: Historiography, Nation-building and Enlightenment Culture* (forthcoming, Edinburgh University Press). Her next project is the history of the Royal Celtic Society.

Jardar Lohne

is a research scientist at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology. He defended his doctoral thesis—*Le triomphe de la vertu—Étude sur les représentations d'une épistémologie morale dans le Télémaque de Fénelon* in 2008. His current interest is applied ethics. The latest publication (Lohne et al., 2017) is *Ethical behavior in the design phase of AEC projects*, International Journal of Managing Projects in Business 10 (2).

Calum A. Maciver

is Lecturer in Classics at the University of Edinburgh. He has also held research posts in Germany and Switzerland. He is author of a monograph on Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica* (2012) and of several articles on epic poetry. He is currently working on a new monograph on Statius and the tradition of ancient scholarship, and recently finished a translation of Quintus as part of the *Collected Imperial Greek Epics* (Berkeley, 2018).

Elizabeth Minchin

is Emeritus Professor of Classics at the Australian National University. She has published extensively on the Homeric epics, including *Homer and the Resources of Memory* (2001) and *Homeric Voices: Discourse, Memory, Gender* (2008).

Francine Mora-Lebrun

received the PhD degree from the University of Paris-Sorbonne in 1992. She has been teaching at the Universities of Paris-Sorbonne, Nantes, and Versailles, where she is currently Professor emeritus. She works on the reception of Antiquity in the Middle Ages. She supervised a French translation of Joseph of Exeter's *Ylias* published by Brepols in 2003 and wrote several articles about it between 2000 and 2012.

Anne Rogerson

is the Charles Tesoriero Senior Lecturer in Latin at the University of Sydney. She works on Virgil's *Aeneid* and its reception from antiquity to the present day, and is the author of *Virgil's Ascanius: Imagining the Future in the Aeneid* (Cambridge University Press, 2016).

Robert Simms

is a Postdoctoral Fellow at the University of Oslo, with research interests in post-Augustan epic as well as Classical Reception, especially in early modern England. His monograph, *Anticipation and Anachrony in Statius' Thebaid*, is forthcoming (Bloomsbury, 2019).

Introduction

Robert Simms

The thematic interests of heroic epic are ‘kings and battles’ (*reges et proelia*), as Virgil has it at *Eclogue* 6.3. These interests dispose the genre toward a confident athanasia: that the great deeds of great men will endure into future ages and never perish. There is, however, another feature of heroic epic narratives that goes largely unconsidered. As Aristotle observes in making his generic comparisons of epic and tragedy, where the latter should contain a single episode, the former is *polumythos*, ‘replete with story’ (*Poetics* 1456a12). Epic is capable of containing several stories, a feature that facilitates an extensive ‘additive’ program, such that the enterprise itself is prone to incompleteness and indefiniteness. But while songs may live forever, singers do not. Lamentable circumstances have allowed *mors immatura* to claim the ends of several works, but even poets of successfully ‘finished’ epics frequently acknowledge or imply that the story is incomplete. Historically, the incompleteness of epic has encouraged the production of continuations, observed as early as the cyclical epics of Archaic Greece, and Homer’s *Iliad*. The *Odyssey* and the *Aeneid* continue the *Iliad*, Silius’ *Punica* continues the *Aeneid*, and so forth. There was also the Medieval and Renaissance vogue of continuing and elaborating unfinished classical epics, as well as the hybridization of Greco-Roman epic and courtly romance, which gave rise to further forms of continuation. The post-modern age also reveals an interest in the aggregation and serialization of epic. The present volume thus explores, in a decidedly interdisciplinary and trans-historical effort, the variety of ways that heroic epic narratives have been continued in the Greco-Roman and western classical traditions through prequels, sequels, and retellings.

As a glance at the table of contents will reveal, the lion’s share of the discussions contained herein concern the Trojan mythos, a theme with which poets and authors of continuations have been continually occupied. This volume divides into two parts. In the first part we take up works more or less related to the Trojan War and/or the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* of Homer. In the second part, we look beyond Troy and Homer; however, there is, naturally, observable overlap and interconnectedness, and the divisions should by no means be considered distinct.

As slices from a larger whole of cyclic epics, which survive now only as epitomes and fragments, the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* by their nature offered gaps and points of departure to fill out and further a much larger and lengthier narrative

picture. These Homeric redactions connect to a sequence that spanned from what the Archaic Greeks understood as the nascence of the world down to the close of the heroic age; however, as Elizabeth Minchin discusses in our opening chapter, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* are also tethered to one another. Minchin examines first how the *Iliad* speculates on future narrative events, external to its terminus, through the depictions of fate and prophecy; statements of conviction; threats, prayers, and wishes of characters; and the explicit words of the Iliadic narrator. Minchin then turns her attention to the ways in which the *Odyssey* does and does not pick up the offered strands of its predecessor.

Reinhold Glei then provides an examination of the *Ilias Latina*, a short Latin hexameter poem of 1070 lines attributed, with some controversy, to Baebius Italicus, and written in the Neronian 60's. The poem heavily influenced medieval literature and endured as a popular standard in Latin education. Were one to read of the Trojan conflict in the Middle Ages it would more likely have been in the *Ilias Latina* than in Homer's original. While Baebius' work presents itself as a condensation and summary, it also reveals, as Glei examines, features that suggest a Roman rereading and continuation of the Homeric *Iliad*, one informed by post-Augustan critique and influence.

The Hellenistic period enjoyed a particular vogue for extending Homeric material. The somewhat lesser known epyllia of Triphiodorus' *The Sack of Troy* and Colluthus' *The Rape of Helen* offer the subject matter for Orestis Karavas' chapter. Of the former we have a sequel composed in 691 verses in roughly the 3rd century that offers a continuation of Homer's *Iliad* and treats similar events to the second book of Virgil's *Aeneid*. Of the latter we have Colluthus' *The Rape of Helen* in 392 hexameters, which visits the seeds of the Trojan conflict. Karavas explores the ways in which these later poets drew their inspiration from other poets besides Homer. As the font of much narrative material it was a particular challenge to create original works within this Homeric dominance. Calum Maciver's discussion then turns our attention toward Quintus of Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica* where he explores Quintus' construction of a Homeric identity that draws on the hexametric poetry of Hesiod and Apollonius as well. In this way, Homer is read through a Hellenistic lens.

The Byzantine poet and scholastic John Tzetzes also sought to enclose the open ends of origin and conclusion to Homer's *Iliad*. Marta Cardin's contribution addresses the *Carmina Iliaca*, or *Little Great Iliad*, of John Tzetzes. This poem treats the Trojan War from the origins of the conflict through to the fall of the city. As a teacher, Tzetzes' poetic efforts have strong didactic qualities that incorporate a variety of sources. In addition, Tzetzes creates his own myths, offers learned annotations to his own verses, and incorporates a style of allegoresis. Not long after after Tzetzes' death, the English poet Joseph of Exeter,

working from the influential narratives of Dictys and Dares, two purported eyewitness accounts of the Trojan war supposed to have been written in Greek and translated into Latin, produced an *Ylias* in six books spanning the origins and close of the conflict. Francine Mora-Lebrun's chapter thus explores Joseph of Exeter's agon with epic sources with an eye toward his overarching didactic motivations.

Robert Henryson's *The Testament of Cresseid* offers a curiosity in being a continuation of a continuation. During the Middle Ages the character of Troilus evolved from the brief surviving mentions of him in antiquity as a young son of Priam into a paragon of courtly lover. Chaucer, working most likely through Boccaccio's version of the tale, left his epic unfinished; however, Henryson provides in Middle Scots 616 verses to complete the episode. Nickolas Haydock examines the competing tensions between irreconcilable narrations. Adam Goldwyn then examines the way in which epic continuation endorses genealogical justification for political power in Dudo of San Quentin's eleventh century *History of the Normans*, which claimed Trojan descent for the Normans, Geoffrey of Monmouth's 12th century *History of the Kings of Britain*, which claimed Trojan descent for the English, and three thirteenth century works: Snorri Sturlusson's *Prose Edda* for the Scandinavian dynasties, and Marco's *Codex Marco* and Martin da Canal's *Les Estoires de Venise* for the Venetians.

The final three chapters of this section move away from the Trojan themes and take up more Odyssean interests. First, Jarder Lohne explores François Fénelon's *Les Aventures de Télémaque*. Written between 1693–1694 in his capacity as Royal Tutor to Le Petit Dauphin (Louis, Duke of Burgundy), then grandson of the reigning Louis XIV. Fenelon's didactic continuation of the first four books of Homer's *Odyssey*, the so-called 'Telemachiad', were aimed at grooming the young prince. In 1699, however, the manuscript was illicitly or intentionally passed to a printer and became an instant literary sensation. Next, Martha Klironomos situates Nikos Kazantzakis' *Odysseia* within a broader discussion of classical reception and national culture. Kazantzakis takes up the itchy-footed Odysseus' travels from the end of *Odyssey* 22 through wanderings which eventually lead him to Antartica. In this chapter, Klironomos explores how Kazantzakis' adaptation of Homer can be interpreted as a dialectic on the rational and irrational. She concludes with a discussion of how Kazantzakis' example engages Simone Weil and Horkheimer and Adorno, who look to Homeric epic to conduct a critique of Axis aggression and virulent articulations of political nationalism. This section closes with Buket Akgün's discussion of Margaret Atwood's *Penelopiad*, in which she argues that Atwood subverts the phallogocentric and male-dominated discourse of Homer's epic through the first person narratives of Penelope and her maids.

From the Trojan themes our discussion migrates out to Roman historical themes. For a number of chapters in this section the presence of Virgil's *Aeneid* can be felt, and it is with regret that a discussion which treats that vital text as a continuation of the *Iliad* could not be secured. Nevertheless, Marie von Glinski offers an apt segue with a discussion of Ovid's rewriting of the epic tradition in the *Metamorphoses* by looking to its 'Little *Iliad*' and 'Little *Aeneid*' in his *carmen perpetuum*. Neil Bernstein then furthers this conversation with a chapter on the use of Virgil as a touchstone in both Ovid's Little *Aeneid* and Silius Italicus' *Punica*, their use having very different aims.

The next four chapters fall within the ambit of a Renaissance concern for supplementing Latin epics. In 1458 Maffeo Vegio completed a short continuation to conclude Virgil's unfinished *Aeneid*, picking up at the moment his forebear leaves off. Anne Rogerson examines Vegio's continuation by looking particularly to how he imposes closure on his source text and engages the *Aeneid* as well as other texts within a Christian world view. Nearly a half-century later Giovan Battista Pio produced a furtherance of the *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus, which forms the subject of Emma Buckley's chapter. Robert Simms then examines the way in which Thomas May uses the affair of Aeneas and Dido to write Caesar's dalliance with Cleopatra in May's Latin and English continuations of Lucan's *Bellum Civile*. Finally, where Silius Italicus' *Punica* stands as the longest surviving Roman epic from classical antiquity, Thomas Ross elected to take the narrative still further to the death of Hannibal. Antony Augoustakis discusses the literary value of Ross' three book supplement and his treatment of Silius' themes and characterizations.

The final two chapters take up epics that warrant considerably more critical attention than they have received in recent years. First, Kristin Lindfield-Ott looks to the epic tradition in 18th century Scotland. At the historical moment during which epic's prominence and potency had seemingly begun to wane, we find here a stubborn productivity. Lindfield-Ott looks to this tradition and situates Wilkie's *Epigoniad*, which takes up the events after the Argive loss at Thebes, within the tradition of other Scottish epics. Indeed, she goes some way in redressing the notion that epic was a defunct genre in the 18th century. The final chapter in this volume takes up Ursula Le Guin's *Lavinia*. This novel published in 2008, just three years after Margaret Atwood's *Penelopiad*, redeploys the latter, 'Iliadic' half of Virgil's *Aeneid*. As Nickolas Haydock observes, Le Guin's novelization contributes to the Virgilian and Trojan epic traditions in ways that subvert the quaint notion of being a translation.

The essays in this volume gather together works and authors that are largely treated in isolation from one another under a single theme, that of continuation. To be sure, there are few other places one might find Margaret Atwood

on the same bill of fare as John Tzetzes. Yet, these two, as with all other works under consideration here, contribute to the open-endedness of epic and the invitation it extends to generations of poets and authors to re-imagine and further the genre's stories. This collection of essays by no means intends a last word, but rather hopes to explore the variety of contexts and environs in which heroic epic has been reimagined and continued.

PART 1

Trojan and Homeric Continuations



The *Odyssey* after the *Iliad*: Ties That Bind

Elizabeth Minchin*

In his 2013 book *The Epic Cycle* Martin West divides the poems of the Trojan cycle into two categories on the basis of their structure.¹ There are the poems that stand as *Einzellieder*, that is, as poems that are “organically unified” and address a “self-contained story”, such as the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.² And there are poems that are not unified in this way, such as the *Cypria* (a collection of episodes that belonged in that span of time that preceded the events of the *Iliad*), the *Little Iliad* (“a concatenation of potential *Einzellieder*”), and the post-Homeric invention, the *Telegony* (“two narrative plots that ... do not harmonize well”).³ Of these *Einzellieder*, as Margalit Finkelberg has argued so well, the Homeric poems saw themselves as different from other songs in that tradition; Homeric poetry distanced itself from the cyclic poems.⁴ Indeed, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* claimed special status within the Greek tradition.⁵ It is against this backdrop that I consider the relationship between those two *Einzellieder* that have survived into our own world, the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*.

The *Iliad* is set in the tenth year of the Trojan War. It tells the story of the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon and the subsequent anger of Achilles and its consequences. The *Odyssey*, on the other hand, tells us of Odysseus’ return to his homeland after the sack of Troy. Indeed, we first engage with the story of the hero’s return only a matter of weeks before he lands on Ithaca—in the tenth year of his *nostos*. There is a great gulf, in terms of the *fabula*, that lies between the two epics, a gulf in which occur significant events in the story of Troy (in outline: the deaths of Antilochus, Memnon, Achilles, and Ajax, the sack of Troy, the departure of the Achaean heroes for their homeland, and the achievement of a homecoming for many). Even the outlook of each

* I thank participants at the ANU’s 2013 Homer Seminar for their comments on the paper from which this chapter developed—especially James O’Maley, who challenged me to think about the absence of Diomedes from the *Odyssey*.

1 For the term ‘cycle’: West (2013) 1; on the formation of a Trojan War cycle: West (2013) 16–20; for a table showing stages of development: West (2013) 25–26.

2 West includes in this category also the *Sack of Troy*: West (2013) 18–20 and 57. Cf. Aristotle, *Poetics* 1459a–b.

3 West (2013) 166 (*Little Iliad*), 290 (*Telegony*).

4 Finkelberg (2011) 200.

5 Finkelberg (2011) 206.

epic is fundamentally different. The *Odyssey* is a song about the suffering and sorrows of war, like the *Iliad*, but also about the rewards of peace and the importance of home;⁶ it concludes not in lamentation, as does the *Iliad*, but on a happier note. It should be easy to make the case, therefore, that the *Odyssey* has only a token connection with the *Iliad*-story.

And yet the epics have always been linked in our minds. No other early epic matches these two poems in length.⁷ The epics are similar too in respect of their organic unity, as I noted above, in their proportion of character-speech, in the poets' use of extended similes, in the oversight of mortal events by the gods on Olympus,⁸ and in their depiction of the nobility and the fragility of mortal men.⁹ Furthermore, the hero of the *Odyssey* was already a well-defined character to audiences who knew the *Iliad*. On reading these two poems, therefore, we are left with the distinct impression that the *Odyssey*-poet has made an effort to engage with, even mesh with, the monumental work of his predecessor.¹⁰

In this chapter I shall not discuss whether both epics were composed by the one singer—that elusive figure whom we call Homer;¹¹ nor shall I discuss those phenomena of oral traditional epic that are common to both poems, such as formulaic language or the script-based composition that we identify with type-scenes. My purpose here is to consider from a narratological standpoint the means—the devices—by which the *Iliad* reaches out to further storytelling and the extent to which the *Odyssey* takes up that invitation. In short, I shall consider the way in which and the degree to which the *Odyssey* frames itself with respect to the *Iliad*.

6 Rutherford (1991–1993) 53–54.

7 Burgess (2005) 345.

8 Rutherford (1991–1993) 40–41.

9 Griffin (1977) 43, 45; and see Gainsford's summative description of the epics: they are “uniquely long, uniquely elevated, uniquely excellent” (Gainsford [2016] 110).

10 On the relative dating of the two epics, see Janko (1982) 188–189: the *Odyssey* is ‘slightly more advanced’ than the *Iliad*. For commentary: Burgess (2001) 52–53 and n. 23. Whereas Burgess' approach, like West's, is from the perspective of the epic cycle, mine, a narratological approach, focusses more closely on the two poems as successful stories.

11 This (unanswerable) question is not germane to my argument in this paper. For the record, however, I work from the assumption that the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* were the work of different poets; and see further below.

The *Iliad* Looks Ahead: Prophecy, Speeches of Conviction, and Narratorial Foreshadowing

In ancient epic the poet's practice is to prepare his audience for the incidents that they are to expect in the storyworld-future.¹² When we turn to the *Iliad* we find that the poet initiates and develops a limited number of threads of anticipation and allows them to run through the poem—Hector will be killed, as will Achilles, and the city of Troy will fall. Only the death of Hector occurs within the timeframe of the epic; but the poet never loses sight of those two remaining story-events, familiar to him and his audience from other sources, namely, other poems and non-poetic legend.¹³ My first task, therefore, is to observe the means by which the *Iliad*-poet makes his audience aware of these projected events, as he reaches out to further storytelling.

Fate

There are several sources of information about the future in the *Iliad*.¹⁴ References to Troy's destiny are introduced relatively early in the epic through informal exchanges between the gods—Zeus, Athene, Hera, or Poseidon. Although Zeus teases Hera (and Athene) with the prospect that Troy might be spared (IV 14–19), he reassures her (34–37) that Troy is hers to destroy: ἔρξον ὅπως ἐθέλεις (“Do as you wish”, 37).¹⁵ And, indeed, Hera reminds Athene, at V 714–716, that she and Athene had promised Menelaus that the Achaeans would ‘go home after sacking the strong-walled city of Ilion’ (Ἴλιον ἐκπέρσαντ’ εὐτείχεον ἀπονέεσθαι, 716).¹⁶ Even that supporter of the Trojan heroes, Apollo, in conversation with Athene recognizes that Troy is doomed: VII 29–32. These informal comments are formalized once and for all when Zeus makes his *ex cathedra* pronouncement at XV 53–71, when he sets out for Hera that sequence of events that will close with the fall of Troy, concluding (69–71) with the words:

ἐκ τοῦ δ' ἄν τοι ἔπειτα παλιώξιν παρὰ νηῶν
αἰὲν ἐγὼ τεύχοιμι διαμπερές εἰς ὃ κ' Ἀχαιοὶ
Ἴλιον αἰπὺ ἔλοιεν Ἀθηναίης διὰ βουλᾶς.

12 Duckworth (1966) 1.

13 Gainsford (2016) 104–112, esp. at 106.

14 On devices used to foreshadow the future, whether contained within the epic or beyond, see Duckworth (1966) 6–27 and 28–32.

15 I use Roman numerals to refer to the books of the *Iliad*. Arabic numerals refer to books of the *Odyssey*.

16 Cf. VII 459–463.

And from then on I would make the fighting surge back from the vessels
always and continuously, until the Achaeans
capture headlong Ilion through the designs of Athene.¹⁷

Prophecy

Amongst mortals we find experienced soothsayers, who read omens in the flight of birds or in dreams or portents: Calchas for the Greeks and Poulydamas for the Trojans. Odysseus, for example, reminds the assembled Achaian troops of the prophetic words of the seer Calchas at II 323–329, especially at 329: τῷ δεκάτῳ δὲ πόλιν αἰρήσομεν εὐρυάγυιαν (“in the tenth year we shall take the city of the wide ways”). I include in this category (prophecy) the divinely inspired knowledge that comes to a great hero at the moment of his death. Hector as he dies looks ahead to the death of Achilles at the hands of Apollo and Paris (xxii 358–360).¹⁸ Achilles, too, once he has chosen to accept a short life of glory, is given this power: attempting to console Priam, Achilles alludes (at xxiv 551) to κακὸν ἄλλο, ‘yet another sorrow’—the sack of Troy.

Statements of Conviction

Running alongside these prophecies and the informal commentary of the gods are statements of conviction amongst mortals from both camps. Agamemnon, who is occasionally negative about the Achaeans’ destiny at Troy (cf. xiv 65–81), is in a positive frame of mind when at iv 164–165 he declares: ἔσsetai ἡμαρ ὅτ’ ἂν ποτ’ ὀλώλη Ἴλιος ἱρή/καὶ Πρίαμος καὶ λαὸς ἐϋμμελίῳ Πριάμοιο (“There will come a day when sacred Ilion shall perish, and Priam, and the people of Priam of the strong ash spear ...”). So too Diomedes at vii 402: ὥς ἤδη Τρῳέσσιν ὀλέθρου πείρατ’ ἐφῆπται, “by this time the terms of death hang over the Trojans”. These statements may be of varying reliability;¹⁹ but when the chance words of mortal participants echo and are corroborated by divine pronouncements and prophetic words reported by the poet they underscore the force of destiny.

More striking, however, are statements of foreboding, especially from the Trojan side. Since we, the audience, have been privy to discussions on Olympus, these words of foreboding ring true.²⁰ At vi 407–439, Andromache argues against her husband’s aggressive battle strategy. Hector’s response to his wife’s rebuke is a clear-eyed assessment of the sufferings to come: he knows well

¹⁷ Richmond Lattimore’s translation.

¹⁸ His addressee may choose to disregard these words: e.g. Hector at xvi 859–861.

¹⁹ Duckworth (1966) 18.

²⁰ Duckworth (1966) 116: events that will occur within the poem are forecast to the audience, but the characters themselves are kept in ignorance of their fate.

that there will come a day ‘when sacred Ilion will perish, and Priam, and the people of Priam of the strong ash spear’ (VI 448–449 = IV 164–165). His own death too is implied in these words, but he does not spell it out. Later in the poem, at its close, Andromache speaks again, at the funeral of Hector, voicing now a lament. Referring to Astyanax, their son, she unwittingly foreshadows his dreadful death (XXIV 734–736): ἢ τις Ἀχαιῶν/ρίψει χειρὸς ἐλῶν ἀπὸ πύργου, λυγρὸν ὄλεθρον,/χωόμενος, ... (“or else some Achaean will take you by hand and hurl you from the tower into horrible death, in anger ...”).²¹

Threats, Prayers, and Wishes

There are also less assured references to the possibility of such events in the future. Ajax utters a threat at XIII 815–816 (ἦ κε πολὺ φθαίῃ εὖ ναιομένη πόλις ὑμῆ/χερσὶν ὑφ’ ἡμετέρῃσιν ἀλοῦσά τε περβομένη τε, “rather, far before this your own strong-founded citadel must go down under our hands, stormed and utterly taken”) that will in fact be confirmed as prophecy when an eagle appears on his right (XIII 821–823). Agamemnon’s prayer at II 412–418, for victory, but before nightfall, will not be granted by Zeus—yet (419). Hector at VI 464–465 wishes that he might be dead before he hears the cries of Andromache as she is taken into captivity; Priam at XXIV 244–246 wishes that he might perish before he sees his city destroyed and its people slaughtered.

The Words of the Narrator

The spoken exchanges between gods or mortals are coloured by emotions of one kind or another: the teasing words of Zeus, the bitterness of Hera, or the grief of Andromache. But on that single occasion when the narrator speaks about what is in store—the sack of Troy and its immediate consequences (XII 1–33)—his words are without emotional content; his tone is dispassionate, perhaps because he is reporting as observable fact an event as yet only foreshadowed in the storyworld. Nevertheless, the narrator simply refers to the sack of the city in the tenth year (15), the return of the Achaeans to their homeland (16), and the destruction of the wall constructed without divine approval (13–33).²² More poignant, however, are the narrator’s words, later in the poem, on the death of Hector, when the city is filled with lamentation: τῷ δὲ μάλιστ’ ἄρ’ ἔην ἐναλίγκιον ὥς εἰ ἅπασα /Ἴλιος ὀφρυόεσσα πυρὶ σμύχοιτο κατ’ ἄκρης (“[i]t was most like what would have happened, if all lowering Ilion had been burning from top to bottom in fire”, XXII 410–411). Of course, this is simply a compari-

²¹ Cf. XXII 63–64.

²² On the Achaean Wall: Hainsworth (1993) 316–321.

son, but these words, “solemn and terrible”, invite us to look ahead to the fall of Troy.²³ In a poem in which the narrator speaks comparatively little in his own voice this is a powerful image.

Thus the *Iliad*-poet creates a dense web of expectation as he looks ahead, beyond the close of the *Iliad*. We are never allowed to forget the imminent death of Achilles: from the early moments of the epic we find references in passing to Achilles’ short life span (I 352) and to his double destiny (IX 410–411); and after the death of Patroclus the intensity of reference is increased.²⁴ As for the sack of Troy, we are offered cameo images of the fire that will engulf the city (XXII 410–411), the deaths of Priam and his family (XXII 59–71; XXIV 732–738), and the enslavement of the women and children (VI 454–455; XXII 62–65). But we hear nothing of the means by which the Achaeans triumphed, the stratagem of the Wooden Horse; and we hear nothing of the deaths of Antilochus and Ajax. Those distracting narrative details and narrative events are carefully sidestepped; the poet keeps his focus, quite strictly, on his two chosen themes.²⁵

Before we leave the *Iliad* I should note that the poet looks back in time as well as looking forward. Nestor, through his reminiscences, takes us back to a past *before* the Trojan War. And at different points of his narrative the *Iliad*-poet uses character-speech to recall events in the Trojan War story that preceded the quarrel in the tenth year.²⁶ Through Helen’s first-person reminiscences the poet canvasses the motive for the attack on Troy; through Antenor’s memories the poet evokes events early in the hostilities; and through his narrative of the contest between Menelaus and Paris he introduces us to the principal players in the dispute.²⁷ Thus the *Iliad*-poet sets his song in its context and establishes its superior status in relation to the wider tradition.

23 Richardson (1993) 150.

24 Achilles’ fate is invoked at XVIII 88–93, 94–96, 329–335, 440–441; XIX 409–410; XX 337; XXII 358–360; XXIII 80–81, 150; XXIV 131–132.

25 For occasional, brief, and unspecific references to the departure of the Achaeans for their homeland, see V 714–717, VII 459–460, XII 16.

26 Anderson (1987) 2 refers to his technique as “piecemeal complementation of information”.

27 On Helen and the motive: III 172–176 (see also Proclus’ summary of the *Cypria*, arg. 2: West [2003] 68–71); on earlier events: III 204–224 (*Cypria*, arg. 10 and XI 138–142); on the principals in the dispute: III 58–120, 245–461. The Catalogue of Ships of *Iliad* II recreates the gathering of forces prior to the assault on Troy. The reminiscences of Nestor, with the exception of XI 765–790 (to Patroclus), extend further back in time (for discussion see Minchin [2005]).

The *Odyssey*-poet, too, looks both ways—as we shall observe. But he uses prophetic words on a much reduced scale to foreshadow the direction of the tale itself (1.76–95; 5.22–42 [the gods in conversation]; 11.100–120 [Teiresias the seer]; 12.37–141 [the immortal Circe]) *and* to look beyond the limits of the *Odyssey* to further action (not only for Odysseus [11.119–137; cf. 23.248–255, 264–284] but also for Telemachus [15.125–129] and Menelaus [4.561–569]).²⁸

The *Odyssey* Looks Back (1): Picking Up Story Threads

According to ‘Monro’s Law’, the *Odyssey* never refers to the main narrative events of the *Iliad*—the anger of Achilles, his return to the fighting to avenge the death of Patroclus, and the death of Hector.²⁹ It is true that there are few references to the events of the *Iliad*; but it is not true that there are none. Even so, it is clear that the poet of the *Odyssey* established a relationship of ‘careful complementarity’ with the *Iliad*.³⁰ Thus, the *Odyssey*-poet is at pains to refer to events in the *fabula* immediately *after* the events recounted in *Iliad* xxiv but *before* the events of the *Odyssey*: the deaths of Antilochus (but not Memnon) and Achilles, the dispute about his armour and the death of Telamonian Ajax, the arrival of Neoptolemus, the Wooden Horse, the Sack of Troy, the recovery of Helen, the murder of Agamemnon, and the experiences of the other Achaeans on their homeward journey.³¹ The *Odyssey*-poet’s restraint with regard to the content of the *Iliad* and his expansiveness with regard to subsequent episodes suggest that he was keenly aware of that earlier great poem.

But how is this story-material conveyed? The *Odyssey*-poet, like the poet of the *Iliad*, is reluctant to break into the narrative himself.³² Like the *Iliad*-poet he uses the words of his characters to supply necessary information. Events

28 As far as we know, not all these prophecies are taken up in the subsequent epic, the *Telegony*: see Proclus’ summary, West (2003) 166–169. On the relation of the *Telegony* to the *Odyssey*, see West (2013) 39, 289–290. As Gainsford (2016) 107–108 notes, although the *Telegony* is post-Homeric there is ‘robust evidence’ for a pre-Homeric *Telegony* legend.

29 Monro (1901) vol. 2, 325. Monro’s Law is not absolute: certain *Iliadic* events, e.g., the death of Patroclus, *are* acknowledged in the *Odyssey*; and note the shared detail of Achilles’ burial at XXIII 91–92 and 24.71–79.

30 Slatkin (2005) 316.

31 Rutherford (1991–1993) 39.

32 For restrained references, see: 1.1–2 (explicit reference to the sacking of Troy’s citadel); 4.227–232 (an oblique reference to Menelaus and Helen’s homeward journey from Egypt [cf. 4.125–132]).

subsequent to the funeral of Hector and essential for our understanding of the tale of Odysseus' return are presented not by the narrator in his own words but in the form of stories or reports. Some tales take the form of personal reminiscence, as Nestor, Menelaus, Helen, Agamemnon, and Odysseus relive their past. Others, notably the third-person songs of Demodocus, are reported by the poet, who, in so doing, employs an unusual (for epic) combination of indirect and free indirect speech.³³ Let us consider these two sources of information in further detail.

Third-person Narratives: Stories about the Experience of Others

The principal third-person narratives of the *Odyssey* are the songs of the bard Demodocus. Although he himself had been untouched by the events at Troy, his stories nevertheless had the power to move his listeners, especially those who had actually been there.³⁴ The first song of Demodocus, at 8.73–82, reports a quarrel between Odysseus and Achilles.³⁵ Demodocus' third song (his second, at 8.266–366, had concerned Hephaestus' detection of his wife's affair), sung at the request of Odysseus, is the story of the Trojan Horse (8.499–520).³⁶ The bard on Scheria is not the only source of information, however, on events that unfolded beyond the end of the *Iliad*-story; even Athene takes on the role of a reporter. Speaking to Telemachus at 1.298–300, she refers in outline to the story of Agamemnon, Aegisthus, and Orestes.

First-person Narratives: The Speaker is a Participant

The first-person narratives of Nestor, Menelaus and Odysseus are of narratological interest for the way in which their respective stories have been so neatly sub-divided and interleaved. Their story-material is presented in small portions, sometimes out of sequence. Nestor gradually releases information about Agamemnon's return and his subsequent death; his account is supplemented by Menelaus, who offers as well the first of four tellings of the Wooden Horse story. These two speakers bring us up to date with the fate of all the major heroes, with the exception of Odysseus.

33 Beck (2012) 37–51: Demodocus' songs are expressive and engaging, but lack the vividness of first-person narratives (and see further below).

34 See, e.g., Odysseus' reactions at 8.83–95 and 521–534.

35 On this song as a possible evocation of the beginning of the Trojan War, see Finkelberg (1998) 145–148; but see Hainsworth's useful discussion in Heubeck, West, and Hainsworth (1990) 351–352.

36 The main narrator intrudes occasionally (at 514 and 516), reminding us that he, not Demodocus, is in charge of the Odysseus-story: Beck (2012) 50.

We recognize from the *Iliad* Nestor's habit of lengthy reminiscence. Responding to Telemachus' questions about the whereabouts of his father, the old man returns in memory to the distant past and speaks of the plundering trips that Achilles led while the Achaeans were at Troy (3.103–106)—a sly reference on the poet's part to the subject matter of the *Iliad* (e.g., at IX 328–329).³⁷ He refers with sorrow to the deaths of Ajax and Achilles (109), of Patroclus (110), and of his own son Antilochus (111–112);³⁸ he refers to the sufferings of the Achaeans for nine long years (118), and, succinctly (130), to the eventual victory at Troy, devised by Odysseus, who μάλα πολλὸν ἐνίκᾳ ... παντοίοισι δόλοισι, “far surpassed others in every kind of stratagem” (121–122). His story of the homecomings of the heroes, taking up a theme introduced briefly by Phemius in *Od.* 1 (but developed more fully in the *Returns*, from the perspective of the Atreidae) is an important contribution to the *Odyssey*-story and will be complemented by Menelaus' account in *Od.* 4.³⁹

The homecomings of the Achaean heroes were, we learn, thwarted by Athene—although the reasons for her anger are elided by Nestor.⁴⁰ Nestor tells the story of his own (and Diomedes') return; he reports too on the homecomings of other heroes, explaining that although he had returned without news of his companions he had gleaned information from his guests over time (184–187).⁴¹ He tells Telemachus that Neoptolemus, Philoctetes and Idomeneus all returned with their full complement of men (188–192); and that Agamemnon, by contrast, returned to be slain by Aegisthus; and that his death was avenged (193–198, 232–235, 255–275, 303–310).⁴² Nestor's tale is released gradually; each episode, offering further detail, identifies the story of Agamemnon as an important backdrop against which the *nostos* of Odysseus will unfold. We shall hear even more detailed accounts from other sources. Finally, we learn something of Menelaus (278–312). All we know at this point, however, is that he returned to his homeland on the day when Orestes raised a grave-mound for Aegisthus and Clytaemestra (309–312).

37 On plundering trips, which must have provided rich material for epic song, see also Proclus' summary of the *Cypria*, arg. 11: West (2003) 78–79.

38 Only the death of Patroclus was narrated in the *Iliad* (xvi 816–857). For those of Antilochus and Achilles see Proclus' summary of the *Aethiopis*, arg. 2 and 3 (West [2003] 110–113); for that of Ajax: *Little Iliad*, arg. 1 (West [2003] 120–121).

39 On the *Nostoi* see West (2013) 246–247.

40 de Jong (2001) 76–77.

41 For further discussion of Diomedes' virtual exclusion from the *Odyssey*, see below.

42 Cf. Proclus' summary of the *Returns*, arg. 5 (West [2003] 156–157).

We observed in *Od.* 3 the poet's tightly controlled release of information about Agamemnon's return and his subsequent death, through his spokesman Nestor. In *Od.* 4 we observe the same restraint, Menelaus now acting as spokesman, when Telemachus and Peisistratus are his guests. Like Nestor, Menelaus, at 4.81–112, begins his reminiscences with a melancholic preamble: even ten years later, the Trojan expedition is still uppermost in his mind. He regrets the loss of life—particularly the death of Agamemnon. Above all he regrets the disappearance of Odysseus (104–112, 169–182)—the hero, he says, without a *nostos* (ἀνόστιμον, 182). After Menelaos and his guests have dined, however, Helen adds to their wine a drug that will make them forget all sorrows. And she takes the floor, telling a story about Odysseus (235–264). The hero, disguising himself as a servant, had entered Troy on a spying mission. Helen alone had recognized him and, seizing the moment, had spoken with him about the intentions of the Achaeans.⁴³

Menelaus caps his wife's story (266–289).⁴⁴ His preamble (267–270), a tribute to Odysseus' wit and his capacity for endurance, echoes Helen's (240–243). Menelaus' story is set inside the Wooden Horse. Within its walls are the leading Achaean heroes, including himself and Odysseus. Menelaus describes how Helen had walked around the horse calling on the heroes by name, adopting the voice of each man's wife. Diomedes and Menelaus, leaping up, almost betrayed their comrades; but Odysseus alone retained his presence of mind, silencing his comrades and thus preserving the ambush. This is the first telling of an episode from the Wooden Horse story in the *Odyssey*. We shall hear of it again in further narratives.⁴⁵

Menelaus' story of his homecoming, which we hear next morning, is taken up at the point where he had parted from Nestor, and had subsequently been driven by the winds to Egypt (4.351–352; cf. 3.299–300). He breaks off his story again (4.586) at the point at which Nestor had picked it up (cf. 3.306–312).⁴⁶

43 The reconnaissance mission is recounted in Proclus' summary of the *Little Iliad*, at arg. 4: West (2003) 122–123.

44 A story against Helen? See de Jong (2001) 101–102. A collaborative story? See Minchin (2007) 277–279.

45 At 8.492–495, 499–520 (the Trojan response); the sacking of the citadel; 11.523–532 (as at 4.266–289 this describes the Achaean experience); and an allusion at 22.230. The poet allows different tellings to give us different perspectives on the Wooden Horse tale. For elements of the Wooden Horse story see Proclus' summary, *Little Iliad*, arg. 4 and 5 (West [2003] 122–125); *Iliou Persis*, arg. 1 (West [2003] 144–145).

46 de Jong (2001) 106. Note the poet's careful allocation of different portions of the story to different speakers.

Thanks to the assistance he is given by Proteus, the Old Man of the Sea, the hero is able to complete his homeward journey (472–480, 543–547).⁴⁷ West proposes that the account of Menelaus' wanderings was developed in the course of the composition of the *Odyssey*; there is evidence, he argues, that the *Odyssey*-poet is "deeply engaged with the *Nostoi* tradition and helping to shape it".⁴⁸ As Menelaus' story unfolds we observe that the *Odyssey*-poet uses Proteus not only as a source of advice to Menelaus but as a convenient source of information about the homecoming of other heroes: Ajax, son of Oileus (499–511); Agamemnon (again! 512–537); and Odysseus (555–560). Proteus gives Menelaus (and, through Menelaus, Telemachus) information about Odysseus' whereabouts: at that time Odysseus was on Ogygia, with the nymph Calypso.

Odysseus' tale of his journey is also told in episodic form, and out of sequence. His account comes in two parts: first, he recounts his experience with Calypso and his arrival on Scheria at 7.241–297; second, he returns to a more distant past, when he and his men left Troy. His narrative (9.39–12.450) brings him to the point of his arrival on Ogygia. Here he calls a halt, since he will not repeat himself (12.450–453). What is particularly relevant to my discussion of the relationship between the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* is a further layer of reminiscence: the hero's account of his meetings in the Underworld with Agamemnon, Achilles, and Telamonian Ajax (11.385–567). For Odysseus, who had been unaware of Agamemnon's story, the king's first-hand account of his death (405–434) comes as a shock (436–439); for the audience it has an insistent force: the poet offers a scenario that warns of what wives can get up to in the absence of their husbands.

Odysseus now meets Achilles (465–540), who, even as a shade, is recognizable as the Achilles of the *Iliad*: he looks back to his time in Troy, when he killed 'the boldest fighters' (500)—although he does not name Hector.⁴⁹ Indeed, he would prefer still to be amongst the living (475–476, 488–491).⁵⁰ He expresses, at 494–503, the same regret and concern about his elderly father that we recognize from the *Iliad* (XXIV 534–542; but see also XVI 15–16, XIX 334–337). Portrayed as an anxious father, he asks about his son, Neoptolemus (492–493; cf. XIX 326–333). This prompts Odysseus to tell a story from the Trojan War (506–537): how he had brought Neoptolemus to Troy from Scyros; how valu-

47 Note also Proteus' prophecy at 561–569 (which reaches beyond the close of the poem): it offers Menelaus a glorious *post-mortem* existence in the Elysian Fields.

48 West (2013) 248–249. West argues that the *Nostoi*-poet was reluctant to duplicate the content of the *Odyssey*; hence he used the Atreidae-story as his framework.

49 Rutherford (1991–1993) 47.

50 de Jong (2001) 290–291.

able Neoptolemus had been in counsel and on the battlefield, as he fought in the front ranks (in Odysseus' view, second best to Memnon [522]); how courageously he had performed in the daring adventure of the Wooden Horse (its third 'telling', 523–532); and, finally, that Neoptolemus, having won his fair share of spoil, had, without injury, boarded his ship for the homeward journey (533–537). From that point, of course, Odysseus can tell no more. Achilles now leaves Odysseus, delighting in Neoptolemus' achievements (539–540). With this news of his son Achilles is able to reconcile himself to his own status in the Underworld.

Finally, Odysseus comes face to face with Ajax, who stands aloof and remains aloof, still angry that Odysseus, and not he, had been awarded Achilles' armour after the hero's death (543–551). Odysseus speaks of the grief of the Achaeans at Ajax' suicide, for he had been the bulwark (556) of the army—as we know from the action of the *Iliad* (for example, xv 281–xvii 761).⁵¹ But Ajax rejects Odysseus' attempts at reconciliation (563–564).⁵²

We hear again from Achilles and Agamemnon later in the epic, after Odysseus, once more a hero and 'stormer of cities' (πτολίπορθος, 22.283), has triumphed over the suitors (22.60–125, 201–329). The souls of the suitors have made their way to the Underworld (24.15–97).⁵³ Here Achilles addresses Agamemnon sympathetically (a development, perhaps, of his respectful tone at xxiii 890–894), wishing for his sake that he had died at Troy and could have been honoured in death by the Achaeans—as opposed to the dishonour that awaited him in Mycenae.

ὡς ὄφελες τιμῆς ἀπονήμενος, ἦς περ ἄνασσες,
 δῆμῳ ἐν Τρώων θάνατον καὶ πτότμον ἐπισπεῖν·
 τῷ κέν τοι τύμβον μὲν ἐποίησαν Παναχαιοί, ...

How I wish that, enjoying that high place of your power,
 you could have met death and destiny in the land of the Trojans.
 So all the Achaeans would have made a mound to cover you ...

Od. 24.30–32

51 Eumaeus (*Od.* 15) and Philoetius (*Od.* 20) also tell tales about their past—a past that involves Odysseus. But the events they recall have no connection with Troy.

52 For further discussion, see Minchin (2006) esp. at 9–10.

53 On 23.297–24.548 as integral to the *Odyssey*-poem, see Heubeck in Russo, Fernández-Galiano, and Heubeck (1992) 353–355; and see now the discussion summarized in Gainsford (2016) 123–124.

Agamemnon in reply (we are struck by the distinctly un-Iliadic cordiality of his response) offers a lengthy description of the funerary rites for Achilles after his death in battle (43–70); the placing of his bones with those of Patroclus (71–79; cf. XXIII 83–92, 243–248), the building of a grave-mound by the Hellespont, to be seen both by men now and those to be born in the future (80–84); and the funeral games hosted by Thetis (85–92).⁵⁴ Here in the Underworld we observe the two heroes—whose quarrel had set in motion the terrible events of the *Iliad*—now on good terms. Whereas Agamemnon's earlier response at XIX 78–144 to Achilles' diplomatic and heartfelt words of reconciliation at 56–73 had been stiff and ungracious,⁵⁵ only now, at the end of the *Odyssey*, do we see their relationship mended. This respectful exchange gives us a clue as to how we might view the relationship between the two poems.

At this point I turn to William Labov's framework for the structure of stories: the series of 'steps' we in the Western world regularly take as we tell a story (abstract, orientation, complicating action, resolution, evaluation, coda).⁵⁶ I am concerned in this paper with the final element in this structure, the coda: this is the element through which we 'seal off' a story. I propose that this scene of reconciliation in *Od.* 24, between Achilles and Agamemnon, serves as a belated coda to the Iliadic story of their quarrel. And later, at 192–202, when Agamemnon, on hearing the suitors' account of Odysseus' triumphant homecoming, comments enviously on the hero's good fortune in having a wife so loyal (ἦ ἄρα σὺν μεγάλῃ ἀρετῇ ἐκτήσω ἄκοιτιν ..., ὥς εὖ μέμνητ' Ὀδυσῆος, Surely you won yourself a wife endowed with great virtue ... how well she remembered Odysseus, 193–194), his evaluative comments serve to seal off that other story: the story of Odysseus' *nostos*—especially as compared with his own.

The *Odyssey* Looks Back (2): Recycling Story Moments and Story Details

The poet of the *Odyssey*, as we have seen, ensures that the two critical story-events foreshadowed but not realized in the *Iliad* are included in his tale as points of reference. He also refers to the content of the *Iliad* in a number of subtle ways, particularly through his use of Iliadic compositional material.

54 Burgess (2008) 98–110. For important discussion of those funeral rituals, their contradiction of the tradition represented by the *Aethiopis*, and the *Odyssey*-poet's allusion to the tradition represented by the *Iliad*, see Edwards (1985) 224–227.

55 See Edwards (1991) 241 and 244.

56 Labov (1972) 365–366; in the context of Homer, see Minchin (2001) 19–20, 185–189.

I am not interested in the formulaic language and the type-scenes that are common to both epics but in elements less ‘typical’ and more individualized, which appear at crucial points of the narrative. I call these elements ‘story-moments’;⁵⁷ and I offer a sample of such moments below. For example, when Telemachus, as guest of Menelaus and Helen, insists (twice!) that he wishes to leave them to return to Ithaca (15.64–66, 87–91), there ensues another meal and a round of gift-giving. Menelaus and Helen go to the palace store-chamber. Helen takes from a storage chest a robe, one that she herself had made. This robe is exceptional, for it lies beneath the others; it is the largest, the loveliest, and shines like a star (107–108): ὃς κάλλιστος ἔην ποικίλμασιν ἢ δὲ μέγιστος, / ἀστὴρ δ’ ὧς ἀπέλαμπεν· ἔκειτο δὲ νείατος ἄλλων. Helen presents the gown to Telemachus as a gift for the future, for his wife to wear at her marriage—and as a souvenir of Helen (123–129). Every audience member familiar with the *Iliad* will recall another visit to another palace store-room—that memorable scene when Hecuba goes into the store-chamber to select a robe to be presented to Athene (VI 288–296). This robe—the largest and loveliest, shining like a star, the work of Sidonian women—had been amongst the robes that Paris and Helen had brought with them when they came to Troy.⁵⁸ Hecuba’s visit is marked by solemnity, because of the nature of her task, and pathos, because the audience knows that Athene will never be well-disposed (311). Despite the gift, Troy will be destroyed. The purpose of Helen’s visit to the store-room in Sparta, on the other hand, anticipates a happy event—marriage, the continuation of the family line, and a more prosperous time for the palace on Ithaca. The *Odyssey*-poet wants us to recall the Iliadic episode and its associations and to use it as a comparand as we process the present scene.⁵⁹

At IX 434–605, Phoenix appeals to Achilles to give up his anger against Agamemnon. In arguing for his right to advise his protégé, Phoenix recreates a scene of intimacy and trust from earlier times (485–491): with young Achilles on his knee he would cut off meat for him and encourage him to eat, holding his cup as he sipped the wine.⁶⁰ Despite this appeal Phoenix is able to achieve

57 Rutherford (1991–1993) 46–53 offers a catalogue of Iliadic vocabulary or motifs used in new, Odyssean, contexts. My examples of ‘story-moments’ are, by contrast, compositional.

58 This is more than a simple type-scene: to a type-scene such as ‘visit to the store-chamber to make a selection from its holdings’ there have been added (a) the selection of a *gift* and (b) the gift of a *woman’s fine handiwork* and (c) *something associated with Helen*. Thus an individualized ‘story-moment’ is created.

59 Like Rutherford ([2001] 145), I avoid the term ‘intertextuality’, which sits uncomfortably in a discussion of oral traditional storytelling.

60 This again is more than a simple type-scene. The Phoenix-scene and the Eurymachus-

only limited success in his attempt to persuade Achilles to return to the fighting; but the older man's love for his protégé is not in doubt. Now observe how the poet of the *Odyssey* uses this scene. After Penelope has accused the leader of the suitors, Antinous, of having plotted to have Telemachus ambushed and killed, Eurymachus responds.⁶¹ In what purport to be reassuring words (16.435–447), he offers as evidence for his own longstanding 'goodwill' to Odysseus' family that same image of intimacy and trust (440–444): when Eurymachus was a child, Odysseus sacker of cities would take him on his knees and feed him pieces of meat and allow him to sip his wine (ἐπεὶ ἦ καὶ ἐμὲ πτολίπορθος Ὀδυσσεύς/πολλάκι γούνασιν οἷσιν ἐφessάμενος κρέας ὀπτὸν / ἐν χείρεσσιν ἔθηκεν ἐπέσχε τε οἶνον ἐρυθρόν, 442–444). And yet we know that Eurymachus was involved in that ambush and was disappointed at its failure (16.346–350). It does not matter whether Eurymachus' story is true; his intentions in telling it are false. His duplicity and his nastiness are highlighted by the inevitable contrast we draw with Phoenix' sincerity.⁶² Some might argue that this 'story-moment' and the preceding example are simply traditional motifs. In my view, however, these are type-scenes that have been elaborated with carefully chosen details; their deployment in the *Odyssey* is another indication that its poet was familiar with the *Iliad*-poet's compositional practice.

Our third story-moment is of a different kind: I turn to the favour that Telemachus asks of Pisistratus (15.195–201) as they return to Pylos. Appealing to the good understanding and affection between them, he asks if Pisistratus would leave him at his ship rather than taking him back to the palace. Quite appropriately in the circumstances, Telemachus offers as a reason the need for haste: he must not be delayed any further by Nestor's 'hospitality' (μή μ' ὁ γέρων ἀέκοντα κατάσχη ... / ἰέμενος φιλέειν). We are reminded of that earlier occasion in *Od.* 3 when Nestor had over-entertained Telemachus and Athene at Pylos: the goddess had been obliged to remind Nestor to allow his guests to retire for the night after a long day of travelling (3.331–336); and, as his guests were at last about to leave for their ship, the old man yet again detained them (κατέρυκε, 345), now to offer them accommodation in the palace (346–355). This is the Nestor of the *Iliad*: the garrulous old man who enjoys above all the role of

scene are built up from similar motifs (for a variant, see Philoetius' memories at 20.209–212). Note too that Phoenix moves beyond the charming image of feeding an infant to some less attractive consequences (490–491). Authenticity (and his own discomfort) becomes a further strategy of persuasion.

61 Antinous and Eurymachus work as a team: Fenik (1974) 198.

62 See Fenik (1974) 198–205 on Eurymachus' hypocrisy; for his slipperiness, see Loudon (1999) 19–20 and 49.

host, the presence of guests, and a chance to talk; he cannot let go.⁶³ On this final occasion, when we *don't* meet this old man, the poet evokes him anyway, alluding to his qualities, so familiar to us from the *Iliad*, with sly amusement.

*Story Details: The Catalogue of Ships as a Resource for Names of
People and Places*

As he embarks on this complex tale of return the *Odyssey*-poet has made a number of *strategic* decisions. First, he reduces to just three the number of Iliadic heroes besides Odysseus who are necessary to his tale: Nestor and Menelaus, his active sources of information, and Agamemnon, whose story is ever in the background. Likewise, he recalls a strictly limited number of fallen heroes: Patroclus, Antilochus, Achilles, and Ajax, whose deaths are critical in the Troy story-chain, and who represent various stages of that Trojan-War past.⁶⁴ Secondly, to authenticate his hero's false identity, he draws upon a select cluster of second-ranking heroes. Finally, and by contrast, the poet (speaking as Odysseus-in-disguise) invents—freely—just once, using an identity that we do not recognize. Let me enlarge on these observations.

Jim Marks draws our attention to the use the poet makes of the Catalogue of Ships in order to establish connections between his characters and to 'anchor' their relationships.⁶⁵ The *Odyssey*-poet likewise exploits the Catalogue-list as a mnemonic resource. To provide a complete account of the pre-*Odyssey* past he has chosen the three heroes, Agamemnon, Menelaus, and Nestor, who appear *seriatim* in the Iliadic Catalogue, at II 569–580, 581–590, and 591–602,⁶⁶ and who regularly track together in the narrative of the *Iliad*. Although Diomedes is part of this select group in the *Iliad* (see II 559–568), he is excluded from the *Odyssey*. I offer two reasons for his exclusion: first, because Achilles is a presence in the *Odyssey*; and, second, because the story of Diomedes' homecoming has many similarities to that of Agamemnon, whose story, for dramatic purposes, must be *sui generis*.⁶⁷ For both these reasons there is no need in the *Odyssey*-tale for the 'substitute' Diomedes.

63 The classic example of Nestor's propensity to engage his visitors in talk is XI 656–803, to a visitor who had said (648–654) that he could not stay! We find this trait also in the *Cypria*, arg. 4b: West (2003) 70–71; it is traditional.

64 See 3.109–112, II.467–470, 24.15–18.

65 See Marks (2012) 103–104 and 106 (on the force of the 'specific geography' of the Catalogue).

66 Marks (2012) 106–107. On the cluster of Agamemnon, Menelaus, Nestor, and Diomedes, see Marks (2012) 108.

67 Diomedes appears in the *Iliad* only when Achilles is a non-participant. For details of

Second, in the false tales Odysseus tells on Ithaca—to Athene, to Eumaeus (with a similar version to the suitors), and to Penelope—he presents himself as a man from Crete, connected with Idomeneus, leader of the Cretan forces at Troy. To Athene, Odysseus asserts that he had killed Idomeneus' son, who had set upon him on his return from Troy with his spoils because he had refused to act as Idomeneus' henchman at Troy (13.256–286). To Eumaeus, Odysseus presents himself as the son of a wealthy man from Crete who had been asked to lead the forces setting out for Troy along with Idomeneus (14.192–359). To his wife, Odysseus identifies himself as Idomeneus' younger brother Aethon (19.165–202, 221–248, 262–307, 336–342).

Although the Idomeneus of the *Iliad* (where he appeared, often with Meriones, as a companion of Odysseus) would have been known to the audience,⁶⁸ he was never a sharply delineated character.⁶⁹ The Idomeneus-figure is therefore readily adaptable to the tales that Odysseus/the *Odyssey*-poet invents. And, in the absence of the Iliadic Meriones, Odysseus or his *alter ego* becomes Idomeneus' companion.⁷⁰ The bond that links Odysseus with Idomeneus *in narrative terms* in the *Iliad* extends also to Thoas, the leader of the Aetolians, who appears in the *Odyssey* in the beggar's 'cloak'-tale (14.499–502):⁷¹ Odysseus, testing the goodwill of his host Eumaeus, spins a tale that involves his disguised self (as beggar) in the protagonist's role, his true self as participant, and Thoas as the fall guy. It is he who unwittingly gives up his cloak to Odysseus (the beggar) when he runs back to Agamemnon with a message manufactured by Odysseus (the participant) apparently on the spur of the moment.⁷²

Diomedes' homecoming, see Servius' commentary on Virgil, *Aen.* 8.9. Philoctetes, whose story demands the intervention of Diomedes, is also elided.

68 See, e.g., II 645–652; VII 165–168; X 53–59.

69 We are told that he is respected amongst his peers, as Agamemnon indicates in his praise (IV 257–264); and see also Idomeneus' discussion about courage in battle with Meriones (XIII 240–297).

70 Unlike Idomeneus, who, although occasionally named along with Odysseus (II 2.404–407, VII 165–168, XIX 310–311), has no special connection with him, Meriones is a fellow bowman: he provides Odysseus with bow, quiver, sword and distinctive helmet for the night-expedition with Diomedes (X 260–265). On Meriones' omission from the *Odyssey*, see Haft (1984) 295–299.

71 Thoas is named in the *Iliad* along with Idomeneus, Meriones, Odysseus and others in response to Nestor's rebuke at VII 162–168. He is mentioned with Meriones at XIII 91–93 and XIX 240; he rallies the troops, including Idomeneus and Meriones, at XV 281–305. Poseidon takes on Thoas' appearance when he addresses Idomeneus at XIII 215–238.

72 See Maronitis (1983) 283–285 for the *Odyssey*-poet's play on the Iliadic/Odyssean theme of throwing one's cloak aside.

These three heroes, like the three great heroes I mentioned above, are neighbours in the Catalogue of Ships: Odysseus at 11 631–637; Thoas at 638–644; and, although geographically separate, Idomeneus (and Meriones) at 645–652. This catalogue-based relationship not only supports the poet, from a cognitive perspective, as he composes; it also has the potential to endow the tales Odysseus tells with a spurious reliability.

Finally, when Odysseus visits his old father Laertes at 24.220–361 he presents himself as Eperitos, the son of Apheidas, son of Polypemon (304–306). This is a totally fictitious identity, invented, as it were, on impulse.⁷³ We might ask why Odysseus, at this late stage of the story of his return, abandons a carefully constructed disguise that connects him to Idomeneus. Masked by that identity he had tested the suitors, the servants in the palace, and his wife. But now, having shed that identity, he cannot resume it. He must find another. On encountering this vulnerable old man completely removed from the news of the world, Odysseus is free to invent.⁷⁴ The new identity he chooses, however, is *unheroic*. This Laertes-scene, at this late point of the *Odyssey*, now represents a complete break with the *Odyssey's* Iliadic past.

Conclusion

The poet of the *Iliad* clearly looks ahead to possible epic continuations—although, as far as we can judge, he has no specific telling in mind. Not only does he foreshadow what will happen within his poem but he looks ahead to two events that fall outside its scope, insisting on their importance through a comprehensive range of speech acts: prophecy, threat, conviction and foreboding. We observe traces of a similar practice in the *Odyssey*—in the perfunctory nod to further storytelling that was to be taken up in the post-Homeric *Telegony*.⁷⁵

But oral traditional epic is not only forward-looking; it also habitually looks back, allowing the poet to position his song in relation to the wider tradition.⁷⁶

73 Heubeck in Russo, Fernández-Galiano and Heubeck (1992) 395–396.

74 The visit to Laertes' farm is a puzzling event. For recent discussion of an alternative ending to the *Odyssey*, which involves, Penelope, Dolon, and a band of loyal retainers, see Haller (2013).

75 As far as we know, not all these prophecies are taken up in the subsequent epic, the *Telegony*: see Proclus' summary, West (2003) 166–169.

76 To this extent these two epics, West's *Einzellieder*, are not entirely self-contained, in the strict sense of the word.

The *Iliad* takes us back to the beginning of the Trojan War and beyond, to the pre-war past. The *Odyssey*-poet is even more intensively retrospective, using first-, second-, and third-person reminiscence to bridge the narrative gap between the two epics. Members of this post-Troy world return unfailingly to their experiences at Troy, and especially to the events that immediately preceded and followed its sacking: a landmark event. The *Odyssey*-poet does not make detailed reference to the events of the *Iliad*, perhaps out of respect for that great song. But he carefully stakes out his own territory:⁷⁷ he picks up the story-threads that connect the *prophecies* and *forebodings* of the *Iliad* about the death of Achilles, the sack of Troy, and the homecomings of the other heroes, and weaves them, along with Iliadic story-moments and story-details, into this new tale.

The *Odyssey*, I suggest, is both an *Einzellied* and a poem of closure. First, with respect to the *Iliad*: the new goodwill that we see between Achilles and Agamemnon in the Underworld seals off that story of rupture. Second, with reference to its own story: at 24.121–190 the suitors in the Underworld tell their story of the courting of Penelope, the return of Odysseus, the stringing of the bow, and their punishment at Odysseus' hands. Agamemnon, then, at 192–198, evaluates the hero's good fortune. With this coda the story of Odysseus' homecoming is now complete. Third, with regard to the Troy-story itself: with Odysseus' successful homecoming and with the Underworld scenes of *Odyssey* 24 the poet brings the stories of all the heroes to their conclusion, calling an end, at last, to evil fighting (πόλεμόν ... κακόν, 24.475), and tying off every loose end.⁷⁸ The Troy-story is over.

All this has been achieved through the poet's careful stewardship of traditional memory, as he responds to the foreshadowing of the *Iliad* and its continuations (in what took eventual shape as the cyclic poems) with polyphonic reminiscence. In making his *Odyssey*-story mesh with the *Iliad* in a variety of ways, at the structural level as well as the compositional, he pays homage to the *Iliad*-poet, and he creates not a sequel,⁷⁹ not a continuation, but a prolonged and satisfying coda.⁸⁰

77 I borrow Scodel's phrase here: Scodel (2004) 4.

78 See Martin (1993) 240; de Jong (2001) 565–566; Biles (2003) 206.

79 As Rutherford proposes (45).

80 On the significance of Telemachus' failure to achieve full heroic status, see the important discussion in Martin (1993) 240; on the hero Telegonus as a post-Homeric invention, see above and (West [2013] 307–308).

Bibliographical References

- Anderson, Ø. 1987. 'Myth, Paradigm and 'Spatial Form' in the *Iliad*'. In J.M. Bremer, I.J.F. de Jong and J. Kalff, eds, *Homer: Beyond Oral Poetry*, Amsterdam, B.R. Grüner, 1–13.
- Beck, D. 2012. 'The Presentation of Song in Homer's *Odyssey*'. In E. Minchin, ed., *Orality, Literacy and Performance in the Ancient World*, Leiden, Brill, 25–53.
- Biles, Z. (2003). 'Perils of Song in Homer's *Odyssey*'. *Phoenix* 57, 191–208.
- Burgess, J. 2001. *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*. Baltimore and London, Johns Hopkins.
- Burgess, J. 2005. 'The Epic Cycle and Fragments'. In J.M. Foley, ed., *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, Oxford and Malden, MA, Blackwell Publishing, 344–352.
- Burgess, J. 2008. *The Death and Afterlife of Achilles*. Baltimore and London, Johns Hopkins.
- de Jong, I. 2001. *A Narratological Commentary on the Odyssey*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Duckworth, G. 1966. *Foreshadowing and Suspense in the Epics of Homer, Apollonius, and Vergil*. New York, Haskell House.
- Edwards, A. 1985. 'Achilles in the Underworld: *Iliad*, *Odyssey*, and *Aethiopis*'. *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies*, 215–227.
- Edwards, M. 1991. *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. 5. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Fenik, B. 1974. *Studies in the Odyssey*. Wiesbaden, Franz Steiner Verlag.
- Finkelberg, M. 1988. *The Birth of Literary Fiction in Ancient Greece*. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Finkelberg, M. 2011. 'Homer and His Peers: Neoanalysis, Oral Theory, and the Status of Homer'. *Trends in Classics* 3, 197–208.
- Gainsford, P. 2016. *Early Greek Hexameter Poetry (Greece and Rome, New Surveys in the Classics 43)*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Griffin, J. 1977. 'The Epic Cycle and the Uniqueness of Homer'. *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 97, 39–53.
- Haft, A. 1984. 'Odysseus, Idomeneus and Meriones: The Cretan Lies of "Odyssey" 13–19'. *The Classical Journal* 79, 289–306.
- Hainsworth, B. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. 3. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Haller, B.S. 2013. 'Dolios in Odyssey 4 and 24: Penelope's Plotting and Alternative Narratives of Odysseus' νόστος'. *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 143, 263–292.
- Heubeck, A., S. West, and J.B. Hainsworth. 1990. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol. 1. Oxford, Clarendon Press.

- Janko, R. 1982. *Homer, Hesiod, and the Hymns: Diachronic Development in Epic Diction*. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Labov, W. 1972. *Language in the Inner City. Studies in the Black English Vernacular*. Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Lattimore, R. 1961. *The Iliad of Homer*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Louden, B. 1999. *The Odyssey: Structure, Narration, and Meaning*. Baltimore and London, Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Marks, J. 2012. 'Ἀρχοὺς αὖ νεῶν ἐρέω: A Programmatic Function of the Iliadic Catalogue of Ships'. In F. Montanari, A. Rengakos, and C. Tsagalis, eds, *Homeric Contexts: Neoanalysis and the Interpretation of Oral Poetry*, Berlin, Walter de Gruyter, 101–112.
- Maronitis, D. 1983. 'Références latentes de l'*Odyssee* à l'*Iliade*'. In C. Froidefond, ed., *Mélanges Edouard Delebecque*, Aix-en-Provence, Université de Provence, 277–291.
- Martin, R. 1993. 'Telemachus and the Last Hero Song'. *Colby Quarterly* 19.3, 222–240.
- Minchin, E. 2001. *Homer and the Resources of Memory: Some Applications of Cognitive Theory to the Iliad and the Odyssey*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Minchin, E. 2005. 'Homer on Autobiographical Memory: The Case of Nestor'. In R. Rabel, ed., *Approaches to Homer Ancient and Modern*, Swansea, The Classical Press of Wales, 55–72.
- Minchin, E. 2006. 'Can One Ever Forget? Homer on the Persistence of Painful Memories'. *Scholia* 15, 2–16.
- Minchin, E. 2007. *Homeric Voices: Discourse, Memory, Gender*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.
- Monro, D.B. 1901. *Homer's Odyssey*, 2 vols. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Redfield, J. 1973. 'The Making of the Odyssey'. In A.C. Yu, ed., *Parnassus Revisited: Modern Critical Essays on the Epic Tradition*, Chicago, American Library Association, 141–154.
- Richardson, N. 1993. *The Iliad: A Commentary*, vol. 6. Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Russo, J., M. Fernández-Galiano, and A. Heubeck. 1992. *A Commentary on Homer's Odyssey*, vol. 3. Oxford, Clarendon Press.
- Rutherford, R. 1991–1993. 'From the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey*'. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 38, 37–54.
- Rutherford, R. 2001. 'From the *Iliad* to the *Odyssey*'. In D. Cairns, ed., *Oxford Readings in Homer's Iliad*, Oxford, Oxford University Press, 117–146.
- Scodel, R. 2004. 'The Modesty of Homer'. In C. Mackie, ed., *Oral Performance and its Context*, Leiden, Brill, 1–19.
- Slatkin, L. 2005. 'Homer's *Odyssey*'. In J.M. Foley, ed., *A Companion to Ancient Epic*, Oxford and Malden, MA, Blackwell Publishing, 315–329.
- Thilo, G. 1961. *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*, vol. 2 (Aeneidos librorum VI–XII commentarii). Hildesheim, Georg Olms.

West, M., ed. and trans. 2003. *Greek Epic Fragments*. Cambridge, MA, and London, Harvard University Press.

West, M. 2013. *The Epic Cycle: A Commentary on the Lost Troy Epics*. Oxford, Oxford University Press.

The *Ilias Latina* as a Roman Continuation of the *Iliad*

Reinhold F. Glei

To the Memory of Helmut van Thiel (1932–2014)



Introduction

Why a Latin *Iliad*? Since the days of Livius Andronicus, who translated the *Odyssey* into the rural dialect of the Latinians, many works of Greek literature have been brought into this language, which became, in the course of time, more and more polished, discarding its former *egestas*. The *Iliad*, however, remained untouched for a long time. Ennius claimed to be Homer reborn, whose soul had transmigrated into him: he was the first to write a Latin epic in hexameters, but its subject was Roman history, setting it apart from the *Iliad*. The poetic interest had transmigrated even before, in the work of Naevius, from the war for Ilium to the war for Carthage. Ennius's *Annals* advanced to be the overall model of the Roman epic in Republican times, inspiring numerous epigonic poems. There were, however, at least two attempts to translate the *Iliad* into Latin: at the beginning of the first century BC, a certain Cn. Matius wrote a Latin *Iliad* in the Ennian style, which seemed outdated even to Varro, who quotes two lines in his work on the Latin language.¹ Due to the very small number of extant fragments, the design of this poem cannot be judged reasonably. Even less is known about the *Iliad* of Ninnius Crassus, who lived, seemingly, in the first century, too. Judging by the quality of the one and a half extant lines² the loss of the poem is perhaps not a very painful one. Surely, with the decline of the Republic, the quality of epic poetry declined,

1 See *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum* (2011) 123. The two lines are from the first book: *corpora Graiorum maerebat mandier igni* (~ A 56) and *obsceni interpret funestique ominis auctor* (~ A 106).

2 See *ibidem*, 128: <ο> *socii, nunc fite viri* (~ Π 270); *nam non<dum> conivi oculus ego deinde sopore* (~ Ω 637). The fragments are cited by Nonius and Priscian, respectively.

too: the neoterics blamed thick books in general and the *Annals* of Volusius in particular (*cacata charta*),³ while Cicero tried to uphold the Ennian tradition by writing such awkward poems as *De consulatu suo*.⁴ We also have some forty lines of translations from Homer's *Iliad* made by Cicero, probably to exercise his poetical skill.⁵ There is no evidence that Cicero wrote a complete Latin *Iliad*.

It was a great task, then, to renew Roman epic in the Homeric, not in the Ennian fashion, and Virgil had undertaken it "in a state of madness", as he said.⁶ He created a poem that outweighed Homer as a whole, i.e. both *Iliad* and *Odyssey*,⁷ not to speak of other sources like Apollonius's *Argonautica*. With the *Aeneid*, the chance to get a Latin *Iliad* had passed away, for nobody was foolish enough to write a Latin epic after Virgil—except for Ovid of course, whose genius found a way of establishing an epic genre of its own.⁸ It took more than half a century until a young rebel rose to challenge the *Aeneid* by writing a protest poem: Lucan's *Pharsalia* is an anti-epic that breaks the rules not only of literary genre, but also of Roman state ideology.⁹ The *IL* was written under the same circumstances, i.e. under the reign of Nero perverting Augustan ideals.¹⁰

It is not my intention to repeat all the arguments put forward in support of this assertion.¹¹ It may suffice to mention the praise of the Julio-Claudian dynasty in line 901f. (see below, ch. 6) and the many similarities to Silver Latin

3 This assessment is made by Catullus (c. 36, 1; see also c. 95, 7). Nothing is known about Volusius's poem.

4 The fragments are also found in *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum* (2011) 159–165. His contemporaries ridiculed Cicero's self-promotion, which can be seen in lines like *o fortunatam natam me consule Romam* (quoted by Sallustius in his *Inv. in Cic.*, 5).

5 *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum* (2011) 168–171. The lines sound fluent, although some of them have an archaic ('Ennian') touch: see, for example, frg. 23, line 10: *sub platano umbrifera, fons unde emanat aquai* (~ B 307). As a rule, Cicero's translations are made not word-by-word ('grammatically'), but rather with a literary ambition ('rhetorically'): on that difference, see Gleï and Reis (2013).

6 Macrobius, *Sat.* 1, 24. 11: *tanta inchoata res est ut paene vitio mentis tantum opus ingressus mihi videar*. Suetonius (*Vita Virgilii*, 46) reports that Virgil answered to his critics that it would be easier to snatch the club from Hercules than a line from Homer: *facilius esse Herculi clavam quam Homero versum subripere*.

7 Suetonius, *Vita Virgilii*, 21: *quasi amborum Homeri carminum instar*.

8 On Ovid's alternative epic concept, see Gleï (1998).

9 See, among others, Meier (2009).

10 This dating has credibly been pointed out by previous studies; see recently Courtney (2001), who proves 65 BC to be a *terminus ante*.

11 See the summarizing article by Scaffai (1985) and the more detailed introduction to his edition (21997).

language, especially Senecan tragedy. Even if the IL undoubtedly comes from Neronian times, the question of authorship is a different issue. The only clue about the author are two acrostics at the beginning and at the end of the text, first detected by Seyffert and Buecheler,¹² which read ITALIC[V]S (the letter v being a conjecture) and SC[R]IPSIT. If we take *Italicus* as a proper name, we have to look for poets who bear that name. Silius Italicus, the author of the *Punica*, has been excluded for reasons of style and metre. A certain Baebius Italicus, cos. suff. of the year 90 (under Domitian) has been suggested as a possible author, but he is not known as a poet, and without the mysterious acrostic, nobody would ever have considered him as the author. It is, however, not necessary to take *Italicus* as a proper name: it may well be an adjective, thus signifying “An Italian [i.e. a Latin] poet wrote it”. The reason why *Italicus* is used instead of the more common *Latinus* or *Romanus*, is simply that the IL inevitably must begin with the letter I, for the keyword to quote the *Iliad* is of course μῆνις or, in Latin, *ira*. If *Italicus* is an adjective, a noun meaning “poet” or the like is required or at least desirable, and fortunately it has been found in the first lines, too, where a mesostich (after the caesura) PIERIS (“Muse”) has been identified.¹³ The word *Pieris*, however, is a feminine noun, and therefore the acrostic might not be *Italicus*, but *Italice* (neglecting the last letter) or *Italices*, i.e. “the Italian Muse” or “Italy’s Muse”. Another possibility is *Italicos* as a (Greek) adverb, signifying “the Muse has written it in the Italian language”.¹⁴ In any case, we should not set on a person named *Italicus*, but leave the question of authorship open.

Although I am not going to write a *Forschungsbericht* here, some remarks on previous studies seem to be necessary. First, it should be noted that the transmission and text of the IL have been widely studied over the last 150 years.¹⁵ The outcome of the 19th and the early 20th centuries were the studies and editions by Baehrens (1881), Plessis (1885), Nathansky (1906/1907) and Vollmer (1913), to name but a few. What we have today is the comprehensive study by Scaffai (1982, 21997), which represents the state of the art and serves

12 See the report in Scaffai (21997) 11f.

13 Schubert (1999). A slight discrepancy lies in the fact that ITALIC*S are eight letters, while PIERIS are only six ones. The remaining two letters are DE, which maybe belong to the final acrostic SCRIPSIT.

14 Depending on what option is voted for, the first word of line 7 must begin with a v, an e or an o: see below, ch. 1.

15 It was therefore completely inappropriate, that Broccia (1992) called his book *Prolegomeni all’ “Omero Latino”*, thus evoking the ground-breaking study of Friedrich August Wolf and at the same time disregarding the work of his predecessors.

as a basis for further research. Since 1997, translations into English, French and Spanish have been published¹⁶—a German translation still lacking. The 21st century saw several studies on the technique of epitomizing and reworking Homeric passages,¹⁷ but to date the IL has elicited relatively little interest among scholars.

It has always been remarked that the IL is not an epitome in the classical sense, i.e. a summary of the single Homeric books in the manner of the Livy *Periochae*, but rather a very selective poem treating the original in its own way. This can easily be seen from a table of contents showing the lines of the IL that correspond to the Homeric books.¹⁸ One half of the total amount of 1070 lines is spent on the first five books of the *Iliad*, while some of the later books are ‘summarized’ in less than ten lines (e.g. Books 9, 13 and 17).¹⁹ Scholars have busily identified corresponding passages and described the composition of the poem.²⁰ What has been neglected so far are the aspects of Romanization. In the following chapters, therefore, I will examine some features of the IL that might demonstrate the nature of the poem as a Roman continuation of the *Iliad*, not in the sense of a supplement (i.e. in the manner of the cyclic poems that tell the events after the burial of Hector), but of a rereading with a Roman’s eyes. This includes Romanization in language (chapter 1), genre and style (chapters 2–4), content (chapter 5), tendency (chapters 6–7) and mood (chapter 8). Finally, in my concluding remarks, I will take stock of the previous chapters, thus offering a new interpretation of the IL.

16 Kennedy (1998), Fry (1998, ²2004)—who translated into blank verse!—, Barrio Vega (2001).

17 See especially Polymerakis (2004), Reitz (2007), Gärtner (2007), Gasti (2008), Polymerakis (2010), Koll (2011). There are only very short entries in the handbook of Rengakos and Zimmermann (2011) 314, and in the *Virgil Encyclopedia*: Cain (2014).

18 See already Plessis (1885) and recently Reitz (2007). The book division according to Reitz is as follows: IL 1–110 (A), 111–251 (B), 252–343 (Γ), 344–388 (Δ), 389–537 (E), 538–563 (Z), 564–649 (H), 650–685 (Θ), 686–695 (I), 696–740 (K), 741–757 (Λ), 758–771 (M), 772–778 (N), 779–789 (Ξ), 790–804 (O), 805–835 (Π), 836–838 (P), 839–891 (Σ), 892–910 (Τ), 911–930 (Υ), 931–943 (Φ), 944–1003 (Χ), 1004–1014 (Ψ), 1015–1062 (Ω).

19 This is a kind of recusatio, the poet refusing to write a long epic poem (on Nero): see Polymerakis (2010).

20 See, for example, Scaffai (1985) 1932–1936, and Stroia (2007).

Ch. 1: Translation and Innovation: The Proem (1–12)

Let us first have a look at the opening passage of both the *Iliad* and the IL, which seem to correspond to each other very closely, as is revealed by a linguistic comparison. The very first word in Homer, μῆνιν, is literally translated by *iram* as an object to ἀειδε (“sing”) and *pande* (“reveal, tell”), which is a traditional phrase in Latin epics²¹ to denote the inspiration by the muse, simply called θεά (*diva*). Achilles is named by his patronymic Πηληϊάδεω (*Pelidae*), while the name itself is replaced in Latin by an epithet, *superbi*, which supplies an important characterization of the hero. In 2, the participle οὐλομένην (“pernicious”) is missing, which is in a way balanced by the addition of *miseris* (“poor”) to the Greeks. Achilles’ wrath caused μυρία ἄλγεα (“countless pains”), which is aggravated by *tristia funera* (“dreadful deaths”). These are, however, slight changes. In the next sentence, Homer differentiates between the souls (which went to Hades) and the heroes “themselves” (αὐτοὺς) eaten by dogs and birds. This passage has been highly elaborated by the Latin author: 4f. *latrantumque dedit rostris volucrumque trahendos illorum exsangues inhumatis ossibus artus* (“it [i.e. the wrath of Achilles] abandoned their lifeless limbs to be dragged by the jaws of barking dogs and by the beaks of birds, because their bones were left unburied”). The sense is the same, but we can see a tendency to exaggerate the sober and somewhat elliptic diction of Homer. The theological explanation: “Thus the will of Zeus was fulfilled” (Διὸς δ’ ἐτελείετο βουλή) is translated almost literally (only paraphrasing Διὸς as *summi regis*). The Greek verb used here should be *conficiebatur* in Latin, which disturbs the metre. Instead, the manuscripts offer *conficiebat*, which is not passive, as is required here. Therefore, editors adopted *confiebat*, which is sound, although forms of *feri* are unusual in composites. This is, however, a negligible problem compared to what is found in the next sentence. The Greek text runs like this: “since the time both heroes (i.e. Agamemnon and Achilles) first turned against each other in quarrel”. The dual forms (διαστήτην ἐρίσαντε) sometimes were misinterpreted even in antiquity, the most curious explanation being that διαστήτην is actually διὰ στήτην (“on account of a woman”).²² The Latin author, however, seems to have understood the form correctly, if *discordia pectora* (“divided hearts”) is meant to be a translation of διαστήτην. The participle ἐρίσαντε (“quarrelling”) is rendered by

21 See Scaffai’s comment on line 1.

22 See the comprehensive article on the ‘ghost-word’ στήτη (“woman”) in *Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* 4 (2010) 221f. See already the explanation of Eustathios (21, 42–46) ad loc.

protulerant pugnas (“they had prolonged fighting”), which cannot be the correct version²³ for two reasons. First, the meaning does not meet the context. It is true that the two heroes, by their quarrel, caused a great disaster, but in fact this did not prolong the Trojan war. Secondly, taking the opening acrostic ITALICVS for granted, the line cannot begin with the letter P anyway. If we think of ITALICVS, the most probable solution is *versarant* (“they had caused [additional] fights”),²⁴ if we need an E, a convenient verb would be *ediderant* (“they had done”), if O, *optulerant* (“they had brought”). In any case, some doubts remain whether the Latin author has matched the sense of the original.²⁵ It remains to be noted that the formulaic line naming Agamemnon and Achilles (Ἀτρεΐδης τε ἄναξ ἀνδρῶν καὶ δῖος Ἀχιλλεύς: “the son of Atreus, commander of warriors, and godlike Achilles”) is rendered with extraordinary poetical skill: 8 *sceptriger Atrides et bello clarus Achilles*.

The next three lines (four in Latin) form a transition to the Chryses episode, which tells why the two heroes came to blows. Both authors, following epic convention undoubtedly established in the epic tradition already before Homer, ask which god had caused the quarrel, and give the answer that it was Apollo, who had sent a plague. At this point, the Latin author deliberately deviates from his model. The Homeric text runs as follows: “For he [i.e. Apollo] was annoyed with the king and unleashed an evil epidemic among the soldiers, and the folks perished.” In the IL, Apollo arouses a severe illness among the Greeks, too (12 *implicuitque gravi Danaorum corpora morbo*), but at the same time, he sends an evil plague (i.e. love) into the heart of the king (9 *infestam regi pestem in praecordia misit*). In Homer, the pestilence is only sent to teach Agamemnon a lesson—here Horace’s famous dictum *quidquid delirant reges, plectuntur Achivi* comes to mind²⁶—, and in the end, the king has to learn it. In the IL, on the contrary, Agamemnon himself is struck by a plague of its own kind, i.e. *amour fou*.²⁷ At first sight, Agamemnon’s love sickness and the pestilence have nothing to do with each other, but the connection is, in fact, given in the following lines. The link is Chryseis, the daughter of Chryses, a priest of Apollo. In Homer, Chryseis is a γέρας (“gift of honour”) to Agamemnon, as part of the spoils of war like other ‘material’ things. In the IL, however, Agamemnon has fallen in love

23 Gasti’s (2007) attempt to defend the manuscript version is not convincing.

24 Other conjectures are listed in the apparatus criticus: Scaffai (21997) ad loc.

25 Anyway, an exact translation would have been possible. I propose, for example: *ex quo dissedere duces ambo altercantes*. The spondaic rhythm is to indicate the long duration of the quarrel.

26 Horace, *Epist.* 1, 2, 14.

27 On the significance of *pestis*, see Broccia (2006).

with the maiden: 25f. *ferus ossibus imis haeret amor spernitque preces damnosa libido* ("wild love, deep rooted in the inner core, and pernicious desire let him despise the priest's plea"). The motif is obviously inspired by Roman love elegy. Since Ovid, Achilles and his slave girl named Briseis have been a couple.²⁸ This explains Achilles' wrath (*μῆνις*, *ira*) as a kind of jealousy, because his beloved girl is taken away by Agamemnon. But even Ovid would not have imagined that the commander himself had fallen in love. Agamemnon is an extremely unsympathetic figure that is not capable of feeling love or any human emotion at all. This is clear from the fact that he is not moved even when his own people die from the disease. Agamemnon in love—this is an innovation by the IL poet, but one wonders if that was really a good idea. The author seems to have it in mind to modernize archaic Homeric culture, but in fact, the plot did not gain more plausibility by this invention.

What we have in the first 12 lines, then, is not a word-by-word translation of the Greek original, but an interpretative, though close, adaptation.²⁹ Some differences may be due to the constraints of metre (like the addition of *mihi* in 1 or the omission of *πολλὰς* in 3, for example), but these are only small instances. Other changes are caused by a tendency to sharpen or rather radicalize the meaning of the original (like the characterization of Achilles as *superbus* in 1 or the proleptic *tristia funera* instead of the "countless pains" in 2). An important divergence is the additional line that explains the elliptic *αὐτοὺς* in 4. The heroes' souls are sent to Hades, while "they themselves" are prey to dogs and birds. The Latin author paraphrases this "themselves" by "their lifeless corpses", thus giving an explanation already found in ancient Homeric exegesis.³⁰ The addition of "with bones unburied" is redundant regarding content, but necessary to fill the line. Both Homer and the author of the IL share the common belief (or rather: epic motif) that after death only the corpse is left on earth, while the soul descends into the Underworld. The Latin author, however, gives a fuller account of that motif, enriched with some dreadful details like the bodies torn to pieces by barking hounds and vultures, seemingly a tribute to Silver Age *Zeitgeschmack*. The main difference, however, is the introduction of the love theme into the plot of the first book, which is thus mingled with the wrath motif prevailing in Homer. Of course, love is nothing new to the Homeric epic

28 Ovid, *Epist. Her.* 3 (Briseis to Achilles). Briseis calls Achilles her master and husband (5 *dominoque viroque*).

29 It seems, however, to be an overestimation of the poet's skills to speak of an "infedeltà programmatica": Broccia (1992) 81 *et passim*.

30 Attested in the D-Scholia and in Aristonikos: see van Thiel (2014) I, 44 f.

(think of Paris and Helen, and in a very different way, of Hector and Andromache, see below ch. 4), but Agamemnon in love is a very special, not to say somewhat burlesque figure. Moreover, we should be cautious not to overestimate the love theme in the IL: calling the whole poem “an erotic rereading of the Iliad”³¹ would go too far. For the moment, however, we stay for a while with Agamemnon and Achilles in love.

Ch. 2: Composition and Intertextuality: The Chryses Episode (13–80)

In Homer, as has been remarked, the reason for the disease is that Agamemnon “disregarded” (ἡτίμασεν, 11) the priest who had come to ransom his daughter. Both deliver a short speech, Chryses a respectful and pleading one, Agamemnon a harsh and scornful response. Consequently, the priest now addresses Apollo in a solemn prayer, and the god prepares himself for revenge: in a magnificent scene, Apollo is described descending from Mount Olympus, carrying the bow and the arrows that emit an eerie sound in the quiver, then sitting down besides the ships and shooting his evil missiles at the Greeks. Mules, dogs and men are hit by the plague, and the pyres smoke. In the IL, the core of the story is the same, but the details are quite different. In the beginning, Chryses is portrayed as a loving father, deeply depressed by the loss of his beloved daughter. It is interesting that the love motif, already used to characterize Agamemnon, plays an important role again here. The sober description of Chryses in Homer is replaced by a highly emotional picture that provides insight into the priest’s mind, just as we know it from Ovid’s heroes and heroines. The speech of Chryses and the response of Agamemnon are not given verbatim in the IL, for it is mainly the complementary love motif that is introduced. While the father’s love is true and sincere, Agamemnon’s *amor* is labelled as *ferus* (“wild, uncontrolled”) and as a *damnosa libido* (“pernicious passion”) (25f.) Chryses, however, falls victim to his passion, too. In Homer, his prayer to Apollo is a quite formal invocation adorned with many cult epithets. Only in the end does the priest modestly express his request for satisfaction. The Latin Chryses, on the contrary, heavily reproaches the god for not having helped him so far and ironically asks him to kill the ‘guilty’ father (41f. *Ecce merentem fige patrem*), since his daughter, being a slave girl and bedfellow of Agamemnon, had to pay for her father’s sins. This way, the Latin author definitely exaggerates the role of

31 Fantuzzi (2012) 174.

Chryses, a minor character in Homer used only as a marionette to provide a sound reason for the plague. On the other hand, the roles of Agamemnon and even of Apollo are downplayed here. Apollo is not allowed a grand entrance like in Homer; here the god simply shoots his arrows at the peoples. However, the images of death are much more impressive than in Homer, the author obviously having learned from Senecan drama and/or Lucanian epic: *vixque rogis superest tellus, vix ignibus aer, deerat ager tumulis* ("there was hardly enough space for pyres, hardly enough air for fire, and there was no soil for mounds"). (47f.)

The following scene describing the quarrel between Achilles and Agamemnon has been shortened drastically by the Latin author. Except for a short statement by the seer Calchas, all speeches have been omitted completely. Moreover, the plot has been simplified. As in Homer, nine days after the beginning of the plague, Achilles (not Agamemnon, the commander!) summons the Greeks to an assembly. Calchas is asked to tell the reason for the disease, and he reveals that Chryses's daughter has to be given back to her father. Agamemnon refuses, but his angry speeches against Calchas and Achilles are only touched upon slightly in the IL. After a short while, Agamemnon is forced to yield and to set the girl free who was his "unwilling lover" (63 *invitos amores*). Nevertheless, the girl is still called a virgin (64 *intactam*) which is not mentioned in Homer and which is not sound if we consider both warrior custom in general and Agamemnon's fierce passion in particular. The Latin author is perhaps influenced here by the ancient novel which mostly presents female heroes (and sometimes male ones, too) who manage to preserve their virginity even among pirates, robbers and other villains. Be that as it may, the girl is sent back to her father on a ship under the command of Odysseus. In this scene, Homer simply uses one of the traditional epithets for Odysseus, πολύμητις (A 311, "prudent"). In the IL (65), however, he is called *cunctis notus Ulixes* ("Ulysses, who is known to all"), which is a clear allusion to the famous Virgilian half-line *sic notus Ulixes* (Aen. 2, 44). This intertextual reference recalls the unfavourable image of Odysseus, the destroyer of Troy, in Roman literature.

What follows is the abduction of Achilles' slave girl, Briseis. In Homer, this is only a material compensation for the loss of Chryseis, which was simply a question of honour and reputation. In the IL, on the contrary, Agamemnon, still burning with love (70 *ardor*) for his girl, mourns his "lost love" (71 *amissos amores*) like a betrayed lover (*deceptus*). Therefore, he wants to pay Achilles back in his own coin and takes his rival's girl, thus "consoling his passion with another one" (73 *solaturque suos alienis ignibus ignes*). Achilles, in turn, is in love with Briseis (as we know from Ovid's epistle), and as a result, he intends to kill Agamemnon with his sword, only held back by Athena. This scene, placed

much earlier in Homer, is transposed to the end of the episode as the high point and climax of the whole narration. The scene ends with an auctorial comment on the evil power of love: without intervention of Athena, “blind passion would have brought an eternal blame to the Greek people” (79f. *turpem caecus amor famam liquisset in aevum gentibus Argolicis*). Perhaps this also hints at Dido’s lack of self-control, who killed herself for *caecus amor* and thus caused eternal misfortune for the Carthaginians.

In sum, it is clear from the analysis given above that the Latin author has reworked the Chryses episode under the auspices of a love concept widespread in Roman literature.³² By a network of intertextual allusions, the author evokes common motifs of love tragedy (Virgil’s Dido), love elegy (Ovid’s Briseis and other heroines) and love romance. At least in this episode, the IL is by no means a translation or abbreviation of Homer, but a literary work in its own right.³³

Ch. 3: Abbreviation and Depersonalization: Glaukos and Diomedes (553–563)

There are, however, Homeric scenes that cannot be called anything but blind abbreviations. The wonderful episode about the encounter of two enemies, who, in the course of a verbal contest, realize their guest-friendship and then decide not to fight each other anymore, is reduced to a poor notice of unrecognizable significance. One is inclined to say that it would have been better to omit the whole scene rather than to give such an empty account.

In Homer, the great scene opens with a self-confident speech of Diomedes boasting about his strength in battle, but at the same time being careful not to fight one of the immortals. Therefore, he asks his adversary to reveal his identity. Glaukos begins with a philosophical reflection concerning the transitoriness of human beings and the emptiness of glory, but then provides a very thorough description of his lineage. This is not without a comical effect of course, and it seems that Homer is mocking a common feature of his own genre. Glaukos tells a very long story, which mainly deals with the adventures of his grandfather Bellerophon. The episode is highly important for several reasons that cannot concern us here.³⁴ When Diomedes recognizes that his own grandfather Oineus once hosted Bellerophon, he is happy to have found a friend

32 See also the reworking of the Paris and Helen figures discussed in Ripoll (2000), Gärtner (2007) and Koll (2011).

33 This is what scholars often emphasized, cf. recently Stroia (2007).

34 It is the only passage where written letters are mentioned: see my considerations in Gle

in the middle of the battlefield. Both warriors descend from their chariots, join hands and exchange their armour; the ‘material’ poet does not forget to mention with tongue in cheek that Glaukos must have been blind, because he changed his golden weapons for bronze ones, a value of a hundred heads of cattle against nine.

This amazing story, which is almost 120 lines long (Z 119–236), has been reduced in the IL to 11 lines. Glaukos meets Diomedes in battle and prepares to attack him. The latter warns him that it would be an unequal fight, for he wounded even Venus and Mars, and then unexpectedly adds: “What you see here, are a host’s weapons!” (559 *Hospitis arma vides*). After this short speech, both heroes, who have completely lost their distinctive personalities in the IL, exchange armour and leave the battlefield. The readers of the Latin version are left with a puzzle, for they cannot understand the strange behaviour of the protagonists, unless they are well versed in Homer. But why should anyone read the IL, who is able to read or has already read the original? Reitz properly argued that the IL was a work “for readers in a hurry”,³⁵ who did not know Homer and had no time (or no ability) to read him. The Glaukos-Diomedes episode in the IL, however, does not allow readers to gain even a superficial impression of what is told in Homer. There is no apology for such a bad adaption.

Ch. 4: Simplification and De-emotionalizing: Hector and Andromache (564–574)

The same holds true for the following 11-line-episode which gives a poor summary of the touching scene where Hector says farewell to his beloved wife Andromache and his son Astyanax (Z 390–496). In all of history there has never been a reader who has not wept and laughed together with Andromache (Z 484 δακρύεν γέλασσα), when baby Astyanax cries out seeing the fierce helmet of his father and then is kissed and caressed by him. No doubt, this is the most emotionalized scene in Homer: far from being kitschy, it moves and touches every human being. The scene is reported ‘correctly’ in the IL, but the poet was not able to arouse the same emotional effect. Like in Homer, when Hector picks up his son, the baby becomes afraid of the helmet. Hector takes it off, embraces his son and prays to Zeus. So why do we read this without any engagement?

(2013) 167–169. Another important motif is the story of Proitos’s wife, who acts like Potifar’s wife in the Bible (*Gen.* 39, 7 ff.).

35 Reitz (2007): “für eilige Leser”.

The crucial point is that Andromache is offstage here.³⁶ In Homer, she is the emotional centre of the scene, not (only) because of her role as wife and mother, but mainly because of her own deep feelings, along with the rhetorical ability to express them. Hector is her husband and, as she freely calls him, potent bedfellow (ζ 430 θαλερὸς παρακοίτης), but at the same time, she adds: “Hector, to me you are father and mother as well as brother” (ζ 429 f.). Hector is all in one, and there is no stronger expression of love ever heard. The poet—as well as the reader—thus assumes the perspective of Andromache. In the IL, by contrast, there is no character with whom the reader may identify or on whom to project his emotions. Virgil was prudent enough not to imitate this scene (and created an emotional centre of his own, i.e. Dido), and even Ovid, the master of women’s psychology, was wary of portraying this dream couple.³⁷ The poet of the IL, in his naiveté, probably did not want to leave out the famous scene, unaware of the sheer impossibility of simplifying and shortening that episode.

Ch. 5: Romanization and Formalization: Republican Institutions (875–879 and 136–140)

The Latin Homer has modelled his shield description on Virgil. We do not see Hephaistos at work, but Thetis simply brings the finished product to her son. Achilles, like Aeneas in the *Aeneid*, scrutinizes this extraordinary work of craftsmanship. Regarding the scenes depicted on the shield, we do not find, however, a lesson in Roman history as seen by an ignorant spectator,³⁸ but rather an abbreviated version of the Homeric ecphrasis, notwithstanding a few Roman elements interspersed. After the description of sky and sea, earth becomes the most important part of the work. It is portrayed with its woods (including monstrous animals), rivers and mountains, and also villages, “where people compete in practicing law and administering age-old justice” (877 f. *in quibus exercent leges annosaeque iura certantes populi*). In Homer, there are people discussing a legal issue, too, but it is a vivid, almost tumultuous scene, not a formal trial. The whole community is involved there, and people side

36 This is explained by Koll (2011) as a behaviour typical of a Roman matron, who is not present in public; the stage set, however, is a private meeting, not an official entrance.

37 Andromache is not even mentioned by name in the *Metamorphoses*, and no letter of Andromache to Hector is extant. There is, however, an imitation of the famous Homeric line quoted above (ζ 429 f.) in the Epistle of Briseis: 52 *tu dominus, tu vir, tu mihi frater eras*.

38 Cf. Virgil, *Aen.* 8, 730: *miratur rerumque ignarus imagine gaudet*.

with or against one of the opponents. In the *IL*, on the contrary, it seems that people are used to going to court, bringing actions against each other as an end in itself since ancient times. It goes without saying that Roman writers often made fun of their compatriots, who are always going to court.³⁹ Seemingly, there is a slight irony here, too. The judge, on the other hand, is depicted as an impartial, objective institution, not as a human individual moved by emotions: “the judge presiding in his place is impartial towards both sides, and decides the quarrel with a serene face” (878f. *sedet illic aequus utrisque iudex et litem discernit fronte serena*). This is the idealized picture of Roman jurisdiction, praised, for example, in the figures of Cato and others.⁴⁰

A contradictory character is introduced in an assembly scene from *Iliad B*. When the soldiers are encouraged by Agamemnon and other leaders to resume the battle, Thersites intervenes. As in Homer, he is called “the ugliest man who came to Troy and whose tongue was the most outrageous” (136f. *quo non deformior alter venerat ad Troiam nec lingua protervior ulli*). In Homer, however, he is, in a way, the spokesperson of the common man (and of the modern reader as well), blaming Agamemnon for egoism and Achilles for limpness. The reason why he is rebuked by Odysseus is that Homer’s aristocratic public did not tolerate a subject speaking against the kings. In the *IL*, the long speeches of Thersites and Odysseus are not reported in full, but reduced only to Thersites’s suggestion to end the war and go home. This would of course be contrary to the logic of an epic plot. Defiant Thersites challenging the nobles might well have reminded a Roman reader of a tribune like Clodius, heavily opposed by Cicero. Cicero in turn may perhaps be seen in the character of Odysseus who is called “famous for his good pieces of advice” here (139 *consiliis illustris Ulixes*). In Neronian times, memory of the late republic and its figures was still alive, so the author could confidently allude to such standard examples.

Ch. 6: Dynastic and Panegyric Features: The Role of Aeneas and Nero (895–902)

Despite Republican reminiscences, the author is a child of his own times. This is shown by the scene following directly after the description of the shield, when Achilles meets Aeneas in combat. As in Homer, it is an unequal fight, and

39 It may suffice to remember Cicero’s remarks on the “laws concerning rain spouts or property walls” (*Leg. 1, 14 de stillicidiorum ac de parietum iure*).

40 See Virgil, *Aen.* 8, 670 *dantem iura Catonem*, and Regulus’ portrait in Horace, c. 3, 5, 50ff.

Aeneas would have died if he had not been saved by the gods (in this case, it is Neptune). It is Aeneas's fate to escape and to continue the line once founded by Dardanus, son of Zeus (γ 302–304). As we know from Virgil, this line leads to Augustus, and the author of the IL takes up the thread and spins it further to his own lifetime, which is, as has been argued, still at the time of the Julio-Claudian dynasty. Aeneas was saved, the author says, “to build, as a refugee, a new Troy in the blessed fields (of Latium) and to raise the Augustan line up to the bright shining stars” (900 f. *ut profugus laetis Troiam repararet in arvis Augustumque genus claris submitteret astris*).⁴¹ Writing under the reign of Nero, the poet deliberately mentions the apotheosis of the Augustan family (in fact, it was only Augustus and Claudius, who had been deified), obviously promising the same honour to the present Emperor. As scholars have pointed out, Nero himself is portrayed on the shield as Apollo playing the lyre (882 f.),⁴² a picture that surely was appreciated by the would-be poet. Apollo is head of the Muses who sing the Paean, i.e. a panegyric song to Apollo; this group is called *Pieridum cohors* (1067) in the epilogue. This corresponds, if we follow the suggestion of Schubert, to the mesostich PIERIS in the proem.⁴³ The poet, then, calls himself a Muse belonging to the inner circle of poets surrounding Nero. It is possible that he later fell victim to Nero's jealousy, especially because the Emperor composed his own Trojan poem. As already argued in the introduction, there is no convincing argument that our Italic Muse was a mediocre political figure under the Flavians. On the other hand, we can think of other possibilities: maybe the poet was clever enough to avoid any suspicion and thus managed to survive the Neronian age, although we do not know anything about his later career.⁴⁴

What remains to be done is to give a comment on the mysterious *diva poesis* of line 890. This “goddess of poetry” neither fits into the metre nor into the context here, since “the others sitting around” (890 *reliquae circaque sedebant*) are named Clotho and Lachesis. Therefore, the missing goddess must be Atropos. It is unclear, however, why the three Parcae are mentioned here and what their relationship to Mars is, who “stood in the very centre, golden in his armour” (889 *Haec inter mediis stabat Mars aureus armis*). In Homer

41 With the word *profugus*, the author clearly alludes to the beginning of the *Aeneid* (1, 2), and the *laeta arva* recall Creusa's description of Latium in *Aen.* 2, 781–783. The variant *armis* (instead of *arvis*) transmitted by the majority of mss. is defended by Grillone (1991), 341, but his arguments are not convincing.

42 See, among others, Scaffai (2007) ad loc.

43 Schubert (1999); see above, introduction.

44 See also below, conclusion.

and Virgil, the Parcae are not shown on the shield, and a connection with Mars is otherwise unknown.⁴⁵ Moreover, it seems strange that Mars is standing in the middle of a peaceful rural landscape, where farmers are ploughing or harvesting, pressing wine or shearing sheep. Even more strange is that the warrior god surrounded by the inexorable goddesses of death should be located in the very centre of the shield. One remembers that, in Virgil, the central scene celebrates the glorious victory of Actium and Augustus's triple triumph. Perhaps the text is much more corrupt here than editors have suggested.⁴⁶

Ch. 7: Cosmological Amplification: The Harmony of Spheres (880–884)

Beyond panegyrics, one should consider that there is a cosmological signification of the shield already in Homer. In the beginning, the Latin author only mentions the stars and the alternation of day and night, as well as the lunar phases, in a general way, but without further details. At least, it should be remarked that he is aware of the identity of Lucifer and Hesperus, i.e. Venus (868 *Lucifer unde suis, unde Hesperus unus uterque exoreretur equis*), which is not a matter of course for a Roman poet. However, 'real' astronomy is not what we are concerned with here. In the context of Nero's portrait as *Apollo lyricus*, it is said that he plays the lyre, which is tuned to resound in seven lovely tones (883 *septemque modis modulatur amoenis*).⁴⁷ This is not surprising, but the point is that the tuning of the lyre is compared to the sound of the universe: "they (i.e. the seven tones) build a symphony that resembles the motion of the world" (884 *carmina componunt mundi resonantia motum*). This is of course the Pythagorean harmony of spheres, which has been known even in Rome at least since Cicero's famous account in his *Somnium Scipionis*: the seven tones of the octave correspond to the sounds emitted by the seven spheres of the planets rotating around earth, which is in the centre of the universe.⁴⁸ The slower the

45 The passage in the *Aspis* of Ps.-Hesiod (258–263), where the three Moirai are mentioned, is expunged by most editors.

46 Scaffai (2007) ad loc. sets only cruces to *+quem diva poesis reliquae+*.

47 The text is problematic here: In the manuscripts, the passage runs like this: *ille ... pollice chordas percurrit septemque modos modulatur amenis*, which makes no sense ("He plays the strings with his thumb and plays the seven tones with the panpipes"). Therefore, *amenis* has been emended to *avenis*, which requires the ablative *modis*. The text constitution remains, however, uncertain.

48 Cicero, *Rep.* 6, 21–23. For an explanation of this concept, see Glei (1991).

speed of the planet, the lower the tone: the order is (from the inner to the outer planets) Moon, Mercury, Venus, Sun, Mars, Jupiter, Saturn, and this *Harmonice Mundi* was still an issue in Kepler's discovery of his third law.⁴⁹ In the 1L, the cosmic harmony is of course a model of Nero's reign on earth.⁵⁰ It is also for that reason that the central piece of the shield cannot be an image of war and death.

Ch. 8: Historical and Political Insinuations: Ransom and Burial of Hector (1015–1062)

The story of old Priam leaving the walls of Troy and going into the camp of Achilles to ransom Hector's body for burial is one of the most impressive episodes in Homer. Being the end of the *Iliad*, it is not only a narrative and emotional highlight, but also a forceful statement of peace and reconciliation finishing an epic of war. In the 1L, this central message has almost faded, replaced by some new and different thoughts. The description of Priam's way into the camp has been considerably shortened, but, as a kind of compensation, the old man is allowed to give a very long speech (indeed 15 lines, which would correspond to some 250 lines of the original, given the same ratio used in the whole poem). He begs for Hector's body, not for his own life, and if Achilles is not willing to ransom the corpse, he then only wishes to follow him into death. In Homer, Priam manages to touch Achilles's heart by reminding him of his aged father, Peleus. Thinking of his own father, Achilles suddenly changes perspectives and takes Priam's view of things. This means that to Achilles, Hector is no longer the hated enemy who killed Patroclus, his beloved friend,⁵¹ but a dead son mourned by his father. Therefore, Achilles allows Priam to take the body with him. This change of perspectives seems to be present in Priam's Latin speech, too, although somewhat distorted. He says: "Have mercy upon the father, and learn to be a father, being lenient with my body!" (1038f. *Miserere parentis et pater esse meo mitis de corpore discite*). "Learn to be a father", this means that Achilles should put himself in a father's position to understand Priam's feelings, and this is exactly what Achilles does in Homer. The argumentation is sound so far. The rest of the sentence, however, is strange. There is no reason why Achilles should be lenient with Priam's body:

49 See Diederich (2014), 97–123.

50 This was observed by Scheda (1966).

51 On the relationship between Achilles and Patroclus, which resembles the couple of Aeneas and Pallas in the *Aeneid*, see Polymerakis (2004).

in the context of the scene, the Latin *corpus* is always used to refer to a dead body,⁵² and the only body in question is of course Hector's (cf., for example, 1044 f. *corpus exsangue ... Hectoreum*), not Priam's.⁵³ Therefore, *meo* is definitely corrupt, and instead we need a pronoun referring to Hector's body. This might be *huius* or, more probably, *illo* or *isto*.

A significant pattern in the IL is that Hector's death marks a turning point in the Trojan war. Homer's *Iliad* tells a story, which is, remarkably enough, completely irrelevant to the 'historical' events. Achilles's quarrel with Agamemnon, his wrath, and the deaths of Patroclus and Hector do not play any role in conquering Troy. It is Odysseus's idea of the Wooden Horse alone that brings down Troy, which is only told in the post-Iliadic epic cycle and adopted by Virgil. In the IL, however, Hector's death symbolizes the end of Troy. This is clearly expressed both by the narrator (1019 f. *Ruit omnis in uno Hectore causa Phrygum* "The fate of Troy as a whole is ruined by the death of only one man, Hector") and by Priam himself (1040 f. *Hectoris interitu vicisti Dardana regna, vicisti Priamum* "Through Hector's death, you have vanquished the kingdom of Troy, you have vanquished Priam"). This interpretation, which adds a historical significance to the IL, probably results from the author's attempt to rival the Aeneid: the burning of Troy described in Virgil's epic is anticipated in the burning of Hector's pyre: "since by this flame, Troy burned" (1056 *ardebat flamma namque Ilion illa*). It also cannot be excluded that the author wants to allude to Nero's own poem *Halosis Ilii* ("Conquest of Troy"), which, according to Suetonius, Nero performed during the disastrous burning of Rome in July 64.⁵⁴ If the poet of the IL intended to allude to Nero (the form *Ilion* is used only here and in line 153), the reference is quite ambivalent as it may be an adulatory address to Nero just as well as a sarcastic comment on the Emperor's pathological madness.

Moreover, there are other insinuations, too. At the end of his speech, Priam utters a prophetic warning that seems almost a formal *memento mori* to the successful emperor: "Remember that also the victor is subject to human fate, and think of the various misfortunes that may strike the powerful!" (1041 f. *sortis reminiscere victor humanae variosque ducum tu respice casus*). Admittedly, this is a commonplace to the Roman reader, but it again provides a certain patriotic note.

52 Therefore, the explanation given by Scaffai (21997) ad loc., that *meo de corpore* signified either *de me* or *de filio meo*, is quite absurd.

53 Remember that Priam was slaughtered only long after Achilles's death. In the *Aeneid*, his beheaded torso lies at the shore of Troy (*Aen.* 2, 557 f.), but this scene cannot be relevant here.

54 Suetonius, *Nero* 38, 2.

A kind of philosophical reasoning, as it seems, is found in the very end of the IL. While the pyre is still burning, Hector's wife Andromache wants to throw herself into the flames in order to die with her husband. This scene is not taken from Homer, but from Virgil, where Dido actually dies on the pyre erected to burn Aeneas's relics (which are, however, part of a pretend voodoo ritual). Andromache is restrained by her handmaid,⁵⁵ until the pyre has burned down completely and until "that great warrior has turned into volatile ashes" (1062 *inque leves abiit tantus dux ille favillas*). These are the poet's last words about Hector: only the epilogue is left, where he tells us that he has reached the "finishing post of mighty Homer" (1066 *metamque potentis Homeri*) and that his mission is now accomplished (1070 *cursu vatis iam ... peracto*).⁵⁶ In Homer, on the contrary, the story goes on. The Trojans extinguish the fire and collect the bones of Hector into a golden urn, which is buried in a tomb, covered with a mound. After the burial, they go into Priam's palace for the funeral meal. Thereafter, as it is known, the epic cycle goes on, and Penthesilea appears.⁵⁷

What remains of Hector in the IL is nothing more than a sorry heap of ashes, gone with the wind. Is that an Epicurean point of view, the ashes being a poetic symbol of the atoms, into which the body is resolved? This is hardly credible. In the first lines of the IL, the poet follows the Homeric distinction between body (which is consumed by animals or, as in the case of Hector, by flames) and soul (which goes into Hades). At the end of his epic, the poet does not speak of the soul anymore. Is it resolved into atoms, too, as Epicurus taught it? Definitely, the poet says that *tantus dux ille*, i.e. the personality of Hector as a whole, is turned to ashes, not only his mortal remains. There are no other traces of Epicureanism in the IL, however. It seems judicious to look for different reasons why there is not only no memorial, but even no memory of Hector in the end.

Conclusion

Undoubtedly, the IL ends on a pessimistic note, which, in a way, counterbalances the panegyric tendencies that dominated the description of the shield. At this point, the reader of this essay might have a sense of *déjà vu* (or more

55 On the constitution of the text, see Grillone (1991), 337 f. The variants are, however, not relevant in the context of our discussion here.

56 On the naval metaphor and its significance in the recusatio context, see Polymerakis (2010).

57 Remember that the very last word of the *Iliad* (ἱπποδάμοιο) is replaced in some later manuscripts by ἡλθε δ' Ἀμαζών, thus introducing the next episode of the cycle.

precisely: *déjà lu*): “a pessimistic note in the final scene, opposite to the panegyrics of the shield”—haven’t we read this so many times referring to Virgil’s *Aeneid*?⁵⁸ Despite Hector’s death, there is an optimistic or at least conciliatory ending in Homer. So why a pessimistic and sobering ending here, if not to imitate and to rival Virgil?

When Nero’s reign had turned into a cruel tyranny, Lucan wrote an anti-Virgilian epic that was an *Umwertung aller Werte* of the Augustan ideology, the *Pharsalia* propagating no less than the senselessness of history. This program was only meagrely concealed by an exaggerated panegyric passage praising Nero, which could not be understood as anything but ironical.⁵⁹ The poet of the IL used a more subtle way (and perhaps a more successful one, if he really outlived the tyrant) by ‘epitomizing’ Homer and imitating Virgil at the same time. As we have seen, the poet takes the Virgilian, not the Homeric shield to elevate the Julio-Claudian dynasty, and in the very end, he evokes a Virgilian model to describe Hector’s pyre.⁶⁰ To everyone who was able to (or wanted to) hear a second voice it was obvious that the ending note of pessimism resembled a Virgilian feature, thus downplaying the imperial voice. However, even an extremely suspicious person like Nero had no hold on the poet, as the IL seemed to be only a Latin version of Homer. Despite its shortcomings regarding narratology and emotional value, the IL can thus be seen as a Roman continuation of the *Iliad* following in Virgil’s footsteps, though his shoes prove too large to fill.

Bibliography

Editions and Translations

- Baehrens, A. (ed.) (1913 [1881]) *Poetae Latini Minores*. Vol. 11.3: Homerus Latinus i.e. Baebii Italici Ilias Latina. Lipsiae.
- Barrio Vega, M. and López, V. (trans.) (2001) *La Ilíada latina. Diario de la Guerra de Troya de Dictys Cretense. Historia de la Destrucción de Troya de Dares Frigio*. Madrid.

58 In 2015, one could have celebrated the 50th anniversary of Putnam’s influential study. I think it is not necessary to discuss the two-voices-theory here. Remarkably, a recent issue of *Classical World* (Volume 111, Number 1, Fall 2017) is almost entirely devoted to “Reflections on the Harvard School”.

59 See above, introduction with note 9.

60 Cain (2014) 647, points to the imitation of the Turnus-Aeneas single combat by the poet of the IL, stating that “the epitomist refracts many Homeric scenes through the lens of Virgilian language”. It is, however, not only Virgilian language, but Virgilian spirit in general that is imitated.

- Blänsdorf, J., Büchner, K., and Morel, W. (eds.) (2011) *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum Epicorum et Lyricorum*. Berlin.
- Fry, G. (ed.) (2004 [1998]) *Récits inédits de la guerre de Troie. L'Illiade Latine de Baebius Italicus, L'Ephéméride de la guerre de Troie de Dictys de Crète, Histoire de la destruction de Troie de Darès de Phrygie*. Paris.
- Kennedy, G.A. (1998) *The Latin Iliad*. Introduction, text, translation and notes. Fort Collins.
- Plessis, F. (ed.) (1885) *Italici Ilias Latina*. Edidit, praefatus est, apparatu critico et indice locuplete instruxit Fridericus Plessis. Paris.
- Scaffai, M. (ed.) (1997 [1982]) *Baebii Italici Ilias Latina*. Introduzione, edizione critica, traduzione italiana e commento. Bologna.
- van Thiel, Helmut (2014) *Aristarch, Aristophanes Byzantios, Demetrios Ixion, Zenodot. Fragmente zur Ilias gesammelt, neu herausgegeben und kommentiert*. 4 Bde. Berlin.

Secondary Literature

- Baumbach, M. and Polleichtner, W. (eds.) (2013) *Innovation aus Tradition. Literaturwissenschaftliche Perspektiven der Vergilforschung*. Trier.
- Binder, G. and Effe, B. (eds.) (1991) *Tod und Jenseits im Altertum*. Trier.
- Broccia, G. (1992) *Prolegomeni all' "Omero Latino"*. Macerata.
- Broccia, G. (2006) "Ilias Latina, 10–12," *Rivista di Cultura Classica e Medioevale* 48.1: 177–180.
- Cain, A. (2014) "Ilias Latina," in R.F. Thomas and J.M. Ziolkowski (eds.), *The Virgil Encyclopedia 2: F-Pe*: 646–647. Chichester.
- Cidre, E. and Buis, B. (eds.) (2011) *La polis sexuada: normas, disturbios y transgresiones del género en la Grecia antigua*. Buenos Aires.
- Courtney, E. (2001) "The Dating of the *Ilias Latina*," *Prometheus* 27: 149–152.
- Diederich, W. (2014) *Der harmonische Aufbau der Welt. Keplers wissenschaftliches und spekulatives Werk*. Hamburg.
- Fantuzzi, M. (2012) *Achilles in Love. Intertextual Studies*. Oxford.
- Gärtner, T. (2007) "Reuige oder persistente Sünderin? Zum Bild der Helena in antiker und mittellateinischer Trojadichtung," *Res Publica Litterarum* 10: 5–30.
- Gasti, E. (2007) "Ilias Latina 7 'protulerant': ένας όρος μεταφραστικής ποιητικής," *Hellenika* 57.1: 165–168.
- Gasti, E. (2008) "Ilias Latina 161–251: παρατηρήσεις στην καταλογική τεχνική του μεταφραστή," *Hellenika* 58.1: 7–26.
- Glei, R. (1991) "Kosmologie statt Eschatologie: Ciceros *Somnium Scipionis*," in Binder and Effe (eds.) (1991) 122–143.
- Glei, R. (1998) "Der interepische poetologische Diskurs: Zum Verhältnis von *Metamorphosen* und *Aeneis*," in Tristram (ed.) (1998) 85–104.
- Glei, R. (ed.) (2009) *Ironie. Griechische und lateinische Fallstudien*. Trier.

- Glei, R. (2013) "Die Auflösung des Textes. Zur literarischen, grammatischen und mathematischen Centonisierung Vergils," in Baumbach and Polleichtner (eds.) (2013) 167–186.
- Glei, R. and Reis, B. (2013) "'Grammatisches' vs. 'rhetorisches' Übersetzen: Zum nicht erhaltenen Original eines Ciceroüberses (FPL 55)," *Philologus* 157/1: 183–193.
- Grillone, A. (1991) "In margine all'edizione più recente dell' 'Ilias Latina' di Bebio Italico," *Hermes* 119: 333–355.
- Koll, F. "Helena y Andrómaca en clave moralizante: una lectura romana de los personajes homéricos en la Ilias Latina," in Cidre and Buis (2011) 327–350.
- Lexikon des frühgriechischen Epos* (1979–2010) Begründet von Bruno Snell. Im Auftrag der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen vorbereitet und herausgegeben vom Thesaurus Linguae Graecae. 4 Bände. Göttingen.
- Meier, M. (2009) "Herrscherpanegyrik im Kontext: Das Beispiel Nero und Lucan," in Glei (ed.) (2009) 107–141.
- Nathansky, A. (1906/7) "Zur Ilias Latina," *Wiener Studien* 28: 306–329; 29: 260–288.
- Perrin, Y. (2007) *Rome, l'Italie et la Grèce: hellénisme et philhellénisme au premier siècle après J.-C.* Bruxelles.
- Polymerakis, F. (2004) "Οψεις μεταφραστικής ποιητικής στη "Λατινική Ιλιάδα": η απόδοση της ομερικής ραψωδίας Σ," *Hellenika* 54: 179–201.
- Polymerakis, F. (2010) "Η κατακλείδα της "Λατινικής Ιλιάδας": σφραγίδα μεταφραστικής ή ποιητικής αυτοσυνειδησίας," *Hellenika* 60: 325–341.
- Putnam, M. (1965) *The Poetry of the Aeneid. Four Studies in Imaginative Unity and Design.* Cambridge, MA.
- Reitz, C. (2007) "Verkürzen und erweitern—literarische Techniken für eilige Leser?," *Hermes* 135: 334–351.
- Rengakos, A. and Zimmerman, B. (eds.) (2011) *Homer-Handbuch. Leben—Werk—Wirkung.* Stuttgart.
- Ripoll, F. (2000) "Réécritures d'un mythe homérique à travers le temps: le personnage de Pâris dans l'épopée latine de Virgile à Stace," *Euphrosyne* 28: 83–112.
- Scaffai, M. (1985) "Aspetti e problemi dell' 'Ilias Latina,'" in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*, 2.32.3: 1926–1941.
- Scheda, G. (1966) "Planeten und Sphärenmusik in der Neronischen Kaiserideologie," *Hermes* 94: 381–384.
- Schubert, C. (1999) "Ein Zeugnis aus Neros Dichterkreis? Zu den Kryptogrammen der *Ilias Latina*," *Würzburger Jahrbücher* 23: 137–141.
- Stroia, L. (2007) "Les rapports entre l'*Ilias Latina* et l'*Iliade* d'Homère. Quelques remarques," in Perrin (ed.) (2007) 331–341.
- Tristram, H. (ed.) (1998) *Neue Methoden der Epenforschung.* Tübingen.

Triphiodorus' *The Sack of Troy* and Colluthus' *The Rape of Helen*: A Sequel and a Prequel from Late Antiquity

Orestis Karavas

Late Antiquity is often thought of by scholars as “a world of poetry”.¹ The survival of many texts such as *encomia* in verse and *Patria*, histories of cities (Pamphrepius of Panopolis, Paul the Silentary, Christodorus of Coptos, Olympiodorus of Thebes, Cyrus of Panopolis, John of Gaza, Dioscorus of Aphroditon, George of Pisidia), historical epics in Homeric style (Olympiodorus' of Thebes *Blemmyomachy*, Pamphrepius' *Isaurica*, Triphiodorus' *Marathoniaca*), didactic poems (Dionysius Periegetes, Oppian of Apamea, Oppian of Cilicia, Marcellus of Sida, the Orphic *Lithica*, Manetho's *Apotelesmatica*), hymns (Synesius of Cyrene, Gregory of Nazianzus, Proclus, Romanos the Melode, the *Orphic Hymns*), innumerable epigrams (Strato, Balbilla, Rufinus, Agathias, Palladas, and many anonymous epigrammatists of the *Palatine* and the *Planudean Anthology*), even iambic and lyric poems (Babrius, Helladius, Marianus, Mesomedes, *Anacreontica*) prove it. Nevertheless, the revival of the mythological epic poetry in Upper Egypt during the first centuries of the Byzantine era is of great importance in our study. Apart from the titles which have come down to us (*Bassarika* and *On Ariadna* by Soterichus Oasites, *Heroic Theogamies* by Pisander of Laranda, *The Story of Hippodamea* by Triphiodorus, *Calydoniaca* by Colluthus and by Soterichus), there are fortunately quite a few representative texts of that literary fashion: Nonnus' *Dionysiaca*, Quintus' of Smyrna *Posthomerica*, Triphiodorus' *The Sack of Troy*, Musaeus' *Hero and Leander*, Colluthus' *The Rape of Helen*, and the Orphic *Argonautica*.

The poets of that time sought to find a way to engrave their names on the wall of immortality through their works. One way of achieving this was by “filling the gaps” Homer left in his poems,² or continuing through them the stories he started. The most popular kind of Homeric continuation was the *Posthomerica*, a superb example of which are the 9,000 verses of Quintus of Smyrna.³ In this chapter I will explore the epic imitations, inspirations and

1 Alsina (1972); Garzya (1987–1988); Miguélez Caverio (2008) 3–105; Agosti (2012) 362–370.

2 Jeffreys (2006) 132; Kim (2010) 179–181 and nn. 10–14.

3 Kim (2010) 15–16; Tomasso (2012) 396, 402.

continuations of two *epyllia*⁴ written in the Egyptian Thebaid between the 3rd and 6th centuries AD: Triphiodorus' *The Sack of Troy* and Colluthus' *The Rape of Helen*. Both poets draw their inspiration not only from the Homeric poems, but also from other epic poetry of the Hellenistic and the Imperial eras. First, I will discuss their objectives behind their choice of subject and second, I will study their language and motifs, in order to understand how they discover, re-work or adapt elements from past literature. Homer was not only the sublime model for every Greek poet, but also a source of innumerable stories.⁵ The challenge for later epic poets lay in creating something original out of Homeric material. Triphiodorus and Colluthus seek to do precisely this, and, judging from the later appeal of their poems, we can see that they succeeded in their objective.

Triphiodorus

Triphiodorus (3rd century AD) was a contemporary of Quintus and left us a short poem of 691 hexameters, entitled *The Sack of Troy* (*Ἀλωσις Ἰλίου*). Among other poems he had composed a *Lipogrammatic Odyssey*—continuing the grammatical games Nestor of Laranda had started with his *Lipogrammatic Iliad*—and also a *Paraphrase of Homer's comparisons*. Both works are now lost.⁶ With *The Sack of Troy* Triphiodorus continues the *Iliad* in a different way to that of classical tragedy, Virgil, and Quintus:⁷ he focuses on a specific episode, namely, the moment of Troy's fall, but is uninterested in what happened to Homer's Greek heroes.

The poem begins with the key-word τέρμα—"end" of the war, just as the *Iliad* begins with the μῆνις—"rage" of Achilles. In the five-line proem, all the main subjects that will be dealt with in the poem are touched upon:⁸ the poet asks Calliope, the patron Muse of epic poetry, to assist him and tell him about

4 On ancient ἐπύλλιον see Hollis (2006); Baumbach and Bär (2012b) IX–XIII; Tomasso (2012) 378–385.

5 Kim (2010) 174: "Homer's legacy to the Imperial world resides not in his role as cultural icon, ambassador of Hellenism, or historiographical recorder of the glorious deeds of the Greek heroic age, but in his capacity as a storyteller, a creator of fictions that have become so powerful that they possess a certain reality of their own, even though they are acknowledged as invented."

6 For Triphiodorus' lost works see Tomasso (2012) 404–408; Miguélez Caverio (2013) 6–8.

7 Miguélez Caverio (2013) 58–61 (Triphiodorus and Tragedy), 64–70 (Triphiodorus and Virgil); Tomasso (2012) 381–382, 395–404 (Triphiodorus and Quintus of Smyrna).

8 Montes Cala (1989); Brioso Sánchez (1996) 110–112; Tomasso (2012) 385–390.

the “long delayed end of the laborious war”⁹ (τέρμα πολυκμήτοιο μεταχρόνιον πολέμοιο; τέρμα corresponds to lines 40–56 of the poem), the “ambush” that led towards the ending of the war (λόχον, i.e. the wooden horse, lines 57–505) and “the ancient strife of men” (ἀρχαίην ἔριν ἀνδρῶν, the final nocturnal battle, lines 506–691). The proem is composed according to the Homeric style, language and expression. Triphiodorus uses an Iliadic sports image as his pattern,¹⁰ and makes a subtle allusion to it by the words μοι σπεύδοντι—“in my haste” (cf. *Il.* 23.767: σπεύδοντι) and τέρμα (cf. *Il.* 23.757: τέρματ’).¹¹ The poet states at the very beginning that, in his poem, he will make use of an extract of the Trojan legend, by Calliope’s intercession.¹²

Right after the short proem, Triphiodorus summarizes, in a succession of thirty-four hexameters, some episodes of the war that preceded the construction of the Trojan horse and the fall of Troy, including a list of the most celebrated dead warriors of both parties. This is a passage of transition in the Homeric style:¹³ it begins with “already the tenth year was rolling on” (ἤδη μὲν δεκάτοιο κυλινδομένου λυκάβαντος, line 6), which is an obvious reference to *Il.* 2.134: “already have nine years of great Zeus gone by” (έννέα δὴ βεβᾶσσι Διὸς μεγάλου ένιαυτοί).¹⁴ Some of these incidents, like the burials of Patroclus and Antilochus, and the deaths of Rhesus and Sarpedon, were described in the *Iliad*.¹⁵ With this resumé, Triphiodorus integrates Iliadic material into his poem and converts it into a sequel to the Homeric one.¹⁶ If there weren’t a proem in the *Sack of Troy*, one could dare say that Triphiodorus felt like he had composed the twenty-fifth book of the *Iliad*.¹⁷

The following lines contain a general picture of the first nine years of the Trojan War. They basically comprise verbs which indicate fatigue and death, and nouns that describe the armour of the combatants (lines 8–13):

9 The Greek text is of Gerlaud (1982) and the English translation of Mair (1928).

10 Montes Cala (1989) 26–27.

11 According to Gerlaud (1982) 103, although the word τέρμα is Homeric, Triphiodorus uses it in a post-Homeric sense.

12 Montes Cala (1989) 31.

13 In the words of Brioso Sánchez (1996) 111. See also Tomasso (2012) 381, n. 37; Miguélez Caverio (2013) 27: “Triph. designs his narrator with the Homeric one in mind.”

14 Miguélez Caverio (2013) 52, n. 81, 135. The English translation is of Murray (1924).

15 Cuartero (1988) 23, n. 44, 79, nn. 10, 13, 14; Miguélez Caverio (2013) 47, nn. 47–49.

16 See the very important thoughts of Tomasso (2012) 395–397.

17 Tomasso (2012) 403: “The plan of Zeus is not fulfilled by the end of the *Iliad*, since the war has not ended; this does, however, happen at the end of the *Capture of Troy*. In this way, Triphiororus’ poem is the ultimate fulfillment of Iliadic events.” See also Miguélez Caverio (2013) 11.

ἐναιρομένων δ' ἄρα φωτῶν
 δούρατα κεκμήκει, ξιφέων δ' ἔθνησκον ἀπειλαί,
 σβέννυτο θωρήκων ἐνοπή, μινύθεσκε δ' ἑλικτὴ
 ἄρμονίῃ ῥηχθεῖσα φερεσσακέων τελαμώνων,
 ἀσπίδες οὐκ ἀνέχοντο μένειν ἔτι δοῦπον ἀκόντων,
 λύετο καμπύλα τόξα, κατέρρεον ὠκέες ἰοί.

With slaying of men the spears were weary, the menace of the swords died, quenched was the din of breastplate, rent and perishing the coiled fabric of shield-carrying baldrics; the shield endured no more to abide the hurtling of javelins, unstrung was the bent bow, the swift arrows decayed.

Right after this schematic degeneration of the war, Triphiodorus devotes three lines to the sorrow of the horses for their dead charioteers. The image of Achilles' horses mourning the dead Patroclus in *Il.* 17.426–462 can be easily recalled. The last part of this summary¹⁸ consists of the description of the death or the burial of some of the most illustrious heroes of the war, both Greeks and Trojans. However, not all of these events occur in the *Iliad*: the death of Achilles, of Antilochus and of Memnon is mentioned only in the *Odyssey* (11.467–540, 3.111–112, and 11.522 respectively), and so is Ajax' suicide (*Od.* 11.543–567). Rhesus', Sarpedon's and Hector's deaths are fully described in the *Iliad*, but we cannot say the same thing about Penthesileia's death.¹⁹ The leader of the Amazons came as an ally to the Trojans just after Hector's death and was killed by Achilles. Nevertheless, she is not at all mentioned by Homer. It is then evident that Triphiodorus draws Homeric material from both poems, but only the Iliadic and post-Iliadic events that are useful to his story.²⁰

Troy may still be standing—due to its walls which were constructed by Apollo and Poseidon—but will fall very soon, since Helenus' prophecies have now been fulfilled: Neoptolemus, Achilles' son, is here, and the Palladium, Athena's wooden statue, is stolen from its temple in Troy. Athena helps (and will keep helping) the Greeks in different ways: she is the god who inspired Epeius to build the wooden horse.²¹ Homeric references to the Trojan horse are not only found in the *Odyssey* (4.266–289, 8.492–520, 11.523–532), as it is well-known and documented; recent work indicates allusions to the wooden

18 Miguélez Caverio (2013) 138 calls it “a reminder more than a proper summary.”

19 Cuartero (1988) 23–24, n. 45.

20 Tomasso (2012) 392.

21 This information belongs to Homer, too (*Od.* 8.492–493).

horse in the *Iliad*, too (23.689–691, 24.778–779, 24.804).²² The construction of the Trojan horse covers the next section of the poem (lines 57–107). It is Triphiodorus' first opportunity to show his rhetorical skills by composing a splendid *ekphrasis* of the wooden statue based not only on the Homeric description of Achilles' shield (*Il.* 18.468–608), but also on the construction of Odysseus' raft (*Od.* 5.243–261).²³ The poet makes a short reference to Phereclus, who built the ships that brought Paris to Sparta, and carried Helen to Troy. Those ships (πήματατος ἀρχήν—"the beginning of woe") were built of the same material as the Trojan horse (the beginning of the end)—the wood of the trees from Mount Ida.

Once the horse was erected, the Greeks deliberated in order to decide which warriors would go in it. The first speech of the poem was made by Odysseus, who resembles more his Iliadic *persona* than his Odyssean one.²⁴ In the same way as in *Il.* 2.278–282, Athena inspires him before he starts to speak. Odysseus encourages the soldiers by reminding them what happened in Aulis, when a snake swallowed a sparrow with its eight chicks, and Calchas interpreted that sign by saying that the war would last nine years and that Troy would fall during the tenth (*Il.* 2.302–329). Without hesitation, twenty-three Greek leaders stand up. However, not all of them appear in the *Iliad*: Odysseus, Menelaus, Anticlus and Diomedes are—according to *Od.* 4.280–286—among the warriors who were into the horse, but there is not a single Homeric reference to Cyanippus, the king of Argos, for example.²⁵ Triphiodorus uses Iliadic scenes of men undertaking a task voluntarily,²⁶ and although he is interested in the Homeric past of his heroes, his primary concern is that his work sound Homeric.²⁷ He employs easily recognizable Homeric similes, as he compares Neoptolemus to a horse (lines 154–156; Paris and Hector are compared to horses in *Il.* 6.506–511 and 15.263–268, respectively), or the hidden volunteers to beasts awaiting in a cave.²⁸ He also uses Homeric formulae such as Νεοπτόλεμος θεοειδής or Τυδείδης Διομήδης (lines 153 and 157). Inside the horse, Athena feeds the warriors with ambrosia, just like she did with Achilles in *Il.* 19.352–354.

22 Mackie (2013) 9–10 and n. 24.

23 Miguélez Caverio (2008) 146, 296–298, 381.

24 Cf. *Il.* 3.216–223. Orsini (1974) 5–10; Miguélez Caverio (2013) 19 and n. 45, 32.

25 Miguélez Caverio (2013) 210–211, 214–226.

26 Miguélez Caverio (2013) 213 indicates that these scenes are in *Il.* 7.161–168, 23.287–301, 23.708–709, 23.811–812, 23.836–838, 23.859–860.

27 Miguélez Caverio (2013) 81, 212–213.

28 Miguélez Caverio (2013) 228.

The Greek leaders are now inside the wooden horse and the door is closed. Agamemnon gives orders to pull down the wall which surrounds it, set fire to the camp and sail to Tenedos, in order to wait there for the signal. This is the starting point of Demodocus' song: in *Od.* 8.492–495, Odysseus asks the poet Demodocus to “sing of the building of the horse of wood, which Epeius made with Athena's help, the horse which once Odysseus led up into the citadel as a thing of guile, when he had filled it with the men who sacked Ilios” (ἀλλ' ἄγε δὴ μετὰβηθι καὶ ἵππου κόσμον ἄεισον / δουρατέου, τὸν Ἐπειὸς ἐποίησεν σὺν Ἀθήνῃ, / ὅν ποτ' ἐς ἀκρόπολιν δόλον ἤγαγε δῖος Ὀδυσσεύς, / ἀνδρῶν ἐμπλήσας οἱ Ἴλιον ἐξαλάπαξαν). Demodocus does as asked:

ὥς φάθ', ὁ δ' ὄρμηθεις θεοῦ ἄρχετο, φαῖνε δ' αἰοδὴν,
 ἔνθεν ἑλών ὥς οἱ μὲν εὐστέλμων ἐπὶ νηῶν
 βάντες ἀπέπλειον, πῦρ ἐν κλισίῃσι βαλόντες,
 Ἀργεῖοι, τοῖ δ' ἤδη ἀγακλυτὸν ἀμφ' Ὀδυσῆα
 ἦατ' ἐνὶ Τρώων ἀγορῇ κεκαλυμμένοι ἵππῳ.

The minstrel, moved by the god, began, and let his song be heard, taking up the tale where the Argives had embarked on their benched ships and were sailing away, after casting fire on their huts, while those others led by glorious Odysseus were now sitting in the place of assembly of the Trojans, hidden in the horse.²⁹

Od. 8.499–503

Triphiodorus managed to compose a literal and thematic sequel to the *Iliad*, regardless of whether he intended to reconstruct Demodocus' song or to make a new original poem of his own.

The Greeks left Sinon behind, a cousin of Odysseus, who belongs to the Trojan legend, although he is not mentioned by Homer.³⁰ He is portrayed by Triphiodorus as a charismatic speaker and he is characterized as ἀπατήλιος (line 220) and πολυμήχανος (line 291), the latter being traditionally attributed to Odysseus. His plan is to deceive the Trojans and make them believe that he is no longer an enemy. In order to accomplish this, he wounds himself, just like Odysseus did in *Od.* 4.244–246. When the Trojans leave the city and debate

29 The English translation is by Murray (1919). About the connections between *The Sack of Troy* and Demodocus' song, see in detail Miguélez Caverio (2008) 327–330; Kim (2010) 102–103 and nn. 40, 48; Miguélez Caverio (2013) 9 and n. 1, 38, n. 4, 120–130.

30 Gerlaud (1982) 21–27; Miguélez Caverio (2013) 241–242, 245.

about the horse in front of it,³¹ Sinon appears as a suppliant and gains Priam's confidence in no time.³² Triphiodorus may have in mind two famous supplicating scenes from the *Iliad*, Thetis towards Zeus (1.500–502), and Priam towards Achilles (24.477–479). Sinon succeeds in persuading the Trojans to bring the horse into the city, and Triphiodorus cannot restrain himself from making a general comment on human lack of sense (lines 310–312): σκέτλιον ἀφραδέων μερόπων γένος, οἷσιν ὁμίχλη / ἄσκοπος ἐσσομένων· κενεῶ δ' ὑπὸ χάρματι πολλοὶ / πολλάκις ἀγνώσσουσι περιπταῖοντες ὀλέθρῳ—“Wretched generation of heedless mortals! For whom a mist which they cannot pierce enwraps the future. By reason of empty joy many men many times stumble unwittingly on destruction.”

Athena intervenes in the transportation of the wooden horse because she does not want the Trojans to give up due to its great weight and the long distance to the city.³³ The women of Troy welcome the horse with enthusiasm, as if it were a holy statue, but Cassandra's reaction is just the opposite: like a maenad, pulling her hair and beating her breast,³⁴ she foretells the women's destiny as war slaves, and her father's and sister's death. She even prophesies events in the distant future, like Agamemnon's murder by Clytemnestra, and her mother's transfiguration into a dog.³⁵ She finally calls the Trojans to destroy or burn “the pregnant horse” (μογοστόκον ἵππον). Her insane behaviour leaves her father no option but to incarcerate her in the palace and keep her away from the celebrations. Priam's speech of disapproval (lines 419–438) follows Homeric patterns.³⁶

The celebrations start and the Trojans drink so much wine that they fall asleep. Meanwhile, Aphrodite orders Helen to go down to the wooden horse and find Menelaus who is hidden inside.³⁷ Helen obeys at once: she walks around the horse and calls the names of the hidden leaders' wives.³⁸ Anticlus is

31 Ypsilanti (2007) 99–107 compares this scene with *Il.* 17.755–759 and also lines 352–357 with *Il.* 3.2–7.

32 Tomasso (2012) 399.

33 The description of the Trojan plain follows *Il.* 12.18–22 and 20.7–11: Gerlaud (1982) 136; Miguélez Caverio (2013) 294.

34 Ypsilanti (2007) 108–114 proves that Triphiodorus has in mind the Iliadic Andromache for his Cassandra's scene.

35 These incidents are treated in the tragedies of Aeschylus and of Euripides.

36 Miguélez Caverio (2013) 36, n. 108, 84, n. 234, 350, 378.

37 Cf. *Il.* 3.121–140 (Iris' visit to Helen), 3.383–420 (Aphrodite's visit to Helen). On Helen's behavior, cf. *Od.* 4.271–289; Orsini (1974) 10–12; Miguélez Caverio (2013) 366.

38 Cf. *Od.* 4.271–289; Orsini (1974) 10–12; Gerlaud (1982) 30–33; Miguélez Caverio (2013) 366: “Triph. thus develops Menelaus' comment on Helen's behaviour in this episode: *Od.* 4.274–275.”

the most tempted to surrender, so Odysseus has no alternative but to smother him.³⁹ Once again, Athena's intervention averts Helen's (that is, Aphrodite's) obvious purpose to destroy the Greeks' plans.⁴⁰ The final battle is about to begin.

The nocturnal battle (lines 506–691) is the last section of the poem, and the most spectacular one. Triphiodorus demonstrates his rhetorical skills in the description of the battle.⁴¹ He starts with the *psychostasia* or *kerostasia*, the well-known image of Zeus weighing the fate of the Greeks and the Trojans, just as he does in *Il.* 8.69–74 (in *Il.* 22.209–213, he weighs the fates of Achilles and of Hector).⁴² The result is in favour of the Greeks. Down on the ground, Sinon gives the signal to the Greeks to come back from Tenedos, and Helen also lights a torch,⁴³ so that the hidden leaders can come out. Triphiodorus uses familiar Homeric images and similes of the spread out Greek forces: he places first the charioteers followed by the footmen,⁴⁴ and he compares the Greek leaders leaving the horse to bees.⁴⁵ He even describes the gods' participation in the battle, just like Homer does in the *Theomachia* (*Il.* 20.1–74).⁴⁶

Most of the victims of the nocturnal battle are anonymous (women, men, elders and children), because the proportions are not Homeric. In the *Iliad*, when a warrior dies, we are informed of his name, generation, family and life story. In *The Sack of Troy*, the length of the poem does not allow the poet to include all these kinds of details.⁴⁷ It goes without saying that the blood scenes follow the Iliadic pattern and that the end of some of the important Trojans is vividly described. Menelaus and Odysseus break into Deiphobus' house (lines 613–633) like wolves:⁴⁸ Odysseus disembowels him and Menelaus recovers his wife;⁴⁹ Neoptolemus kills Priam (lines 634–643), who took refuge

39 In Homer, Odysseus only covers Anticlus' mouth with his hand: *Od.* 4.286–288.

40 Cf. *Il.* 1.194–200 (Athena's visit to Achilles); Miguélez Caveró (2013) 377–379.

41 Miguélez Caveró (2013) 387–390.

42 See also *Il.* 14.510, 16.658, 19.223–224.

43 About Helen's reaction, see the thoughts of Miguélez Caveró (2013) 400.

44 Cf. *Il.* 4.297–309; Miguélez Caveró (2013) 408.

45 Cf. *Il.* 2.87–90, 16.259–265; Gerlaud (1982) 153.

46 Gerlaud (1982) 35–36.

47 Nevertheless, see Cuartero (1988) 40, n. 130.

48 A common Homeric simile: Miguélez Caveró (2013) 441.

49 Cf. *Od.* 8.516–520, *Il.* 12.127–161; Gerlaud (1982) 162. About Triphiodorus' missed chance to exploit the scene between the two husbands, see the interesting thoughts of Cuartero (1988) 43–44.

in the temple of Zeus;⁵⁰ Odysseus throws little Astyanax down from the citadel (lines 644–646);⁵¹ Ajax rapes Cassandra (lines 647–650), although she, too, took to the temple of Athena.⁵² However, not all the Trojans are killed. Aeneas is rescued by his mother, Aphrodite (lines 651–655);⁵³ Antenor, his wife Theano, and their children are saved by Menelaus (lines 656–659), because of Antenor's hospitality in *Il.* 3.205–207;⁵⁴ Laodice, the daughter of Priam and Hecuba, is miraculously swallowed up by the ground (lines 660–663).⁵⁵

Triphiodorus announces that he cannot go any further (lines 664–667):

πάσαν δ' οὐκ ἂν ἔγωγε μόθου χύσιν αἰείσαιμι
κρινάμενος τὰ ἕκαστα καὶ ἄλγεα νυκτὸς ἐκείνης.
Μουσάων ὄδε μόχθος· ἐγὼ δ' ἅ περ ἵππον ἐλάσσω
τέρματος ἀμφιέλισσαν ἐπιψαύουσιν αἰοιδὴν.

All the multitude of strife and the sorrows of that night I could not sing, distinguishing each event. This is the Muses' task; and I shall drive, as it were a horse, a song which, wheeling about, grazes the turning post.

He imitates the epic poet who is incapable of reproducing a detailed description of something and asks for divine assistance once more.⁵⁶ But Triphiodorus feels that he has fulfilled his purpose. He closes his poem at this point, with the same word that he opened it: *τέρμα* (line 667). Besides, according to his preliminary statement of the poem, his song would be “speedy” (*ταχείη*), without too many details.

The Trojans are compared to fish caught in a net. The Greeks burn the city, sacrifice Polyxena on Achilles' grave, distribute the treasures and depart home. Once again, Triphiodorus uses Homeric information to build his last images. The maritime simile is drawn from *Od.* 22.383–387. Poseidon and Hera—who are unsympathetic to the Trojans—fan the flames that consume the city, but

50 Cf. *Il.* 22.66–71; Tomasso (2012) 400.

51 Cf. *Il.* 24.734–735; Mackie (2013) 10–11.

52 All but the last event had been foreseen by Cassandra. Miguélez Caverio (2013) 394 proves that this episode follows the order of Cassandra's prophecies.

53 Miguélez Caverio (2013) 456: “Just another example of a god or goddess trying to save his or her son from being killed in battle.”

54 See also *Il.* 7.347–353, 11.138–142.

55 The same happened to saint Thecla (1st century AD) and to saint Ariadne of Phrygia (2nd century AD).

56 Miguélez Caverio (2013) 27, n. 72, 464.

the river Xanthus (Simoeis) does not dare to extinguish the fire, because in *Il.* 21.328–382 he had been defeated by the two gods. Finally, the return home of the ships is being impeded by dead Achilles' wrath. And with this keyword (μῆνιν, line 687), Triphiodorus connects the last lines of his poem to the very first word of the *Iliad*.

Colluthus

Almost three centuries later, Colluthus tries something even more original, as he composes a prequel to the *Iliad*. The inspiration for his short poem *The Rape of Helen* comes from a well known story from the *Cypria*, but also Triphiodorus' lines: Cassandra's reaction to the Trojan horse entering the city in *The Sack of Troy* is rewritten by Colluthus as Cassandra's reaction to Paris bringing Helen inside Troy. Thus, the poet continues the *Iliad* in an inverse way, by trying to depict what had happened before and what caused the fall of Troy.

There is inadequate biographical information about Colluthus, and most of it comes from the article in *Suda*, κ1951, according to which the poet originated from the Egyptian Lycopolis—the Neoplatonist Plotinus' hometown. He was an *epopoios*, flourished during the reign of Anastasius I (491–518), and among his writings were a six-book epic poem with the title *Calydoniaca*, a poem whose title (or subject) was *Persica*, and some *encomia* in verse. Questions about whether he was a Greek of Egypt or a Hellenized Egyptian, a *grammatikos* or not, a Christian or a Pagan, are neither posed nor answered. Neither is mentioned his only surviving poem, *The Rape of Helen* (Ἐλένης ἄρπαγή). Nevertheless, this little information is enough to describe Colluthus as a typical intellectual and literate of his time.

Colluthus was a poet by profession, a common practice of that time,⁵⁷ most of them being *grammatikoi*, professors of letters.⁵⁸ We also know that Pagans and Christians shared the same education and culture,⁵⁹ and that one of the main characteristics of the poets of that time was mobility,⁶⁰ although there is no special mention of Colluthus' travels in the article in *Suda*. Finally, the

57 Cameron (1965) 477–484; Alsina (1972) 146; Miguélez Caverio (2008) 97–99 and n. 353.

58 Cameron (1965) 491–497. Alsina (1972) 147–148 underlines the difficulty of understanding their work without knowing the previous Greek literary production. Agosti (2012) 369 matches Colluthus with a well-known γραμματικός of that time.

59 Cameron (1965) 471–477; Hernández de la Fuente (2004) 393; Angelis (2005) 43; Cameron (2007) 21, 28–29.

60 Cameron (1965) 484–491.

subjects of his poems are not at all different from the subjects of the rest of the poetic production of that period, as we saw above in our Introduction.

The legend of the rape of Helen was already shaped in every detail since Homer's time and one couldn't ask for originality in the poems which deal with it.⁶¹ The story begins with the marriage of Thetis and Peleus; continues with the apple of Eris and the beauty contest of the three goddesses, Aphrodite, Hera and Athena; and it ends with the building of the fleet by Paris and the trip to Sparta where he kidnaps Helen and brings her to Troy. Every poet or prose writer who dealt with the causes of the war of Troy chose to illuminate the aspects of the myth that interested him the most and to conceal those which did not serve his purpose.⁶²

Homer mentions the rape of Helen in the *Iliad* (3.46–49, 3.174–175, 6.292, 24.763–764) and in the *Odyssey* (4.262–263), as well as the beauty contest of the three goddesses (*Il.* 24.28–30).⁶³ We also find Homer's traces in various patterns, apart from the language, the metrics and the general atmosphere:⁶⁴ the angry goddess (lines 41–58 = *Il.* 9.533–540), Aphrodite's toilette (lines 81–83 = *Od.* 8.364–366), the description of the building of Paris' fleet (lines 192–199 = *Il.* 5.59–64), the throwing of the apple by Eris (lines 62–63 = *Il.* 23.840), Aphrodite's triumphal discourse as the winner of the beauty contest (lines 169–189 = *Il.* 5.416–430), Helen's very hesitant first speech towards Paris (lines 266–275 = *Od.* 7.237–239) or inconsolable Hermione's sleep and dream (lines 363–379 = *Od.* 4.793–841).

Colluthus starts his poem by invoking the goddesses who will inspire him and help him tell his story. The poet does not invoke the Muses, but the Nymphs of Troy, making clear to the reader in the very first line that the poem which follows is not Homer's but a prequel to his *Iliad*.⁶⁵ This novelistic invocation of the Nymphs of Troy is easily explained, for they were eyewitnesses of the

61 Alsina Clota (1957). Cuartero i Iborra (2003) 188, n. 36, calls it "public domain".

62 Cuartero i Iborra (2003) 189. For more information and comparisons between Colluthus' poem and its sources, see Orsini (1972) IX–XXVII; Cuartero i Iborra (1992) 19–36; Sánchez Martínez (2006) 953–962; Karavas (2014).

63 Mackie (2013).

64 Homer's legacy is manifest in Colluthus' vocabulary not only in the use of *hapax* or *dis legomena*, but also in the use of hemistichs, expressions, the *-oio* genitive and the *tnesis*: see Orsini (1972) XXX–XXXIII; Cuartero i Iborra (1992) 56–61 (who calls him more Homeric than Nonnus); Brioso Sánchez (1999) 43–44 and n. 92; Miguélez Caverio (2008) 154–156. Furthermore, as Elderkin (1906) 3 and 6 remarks, out of all epic poets Colluthus has the closest to the Homeric percentage of speeches in his poem: in *The Rape of Helen* we find one speech every 24.5 lines, which is almost the same rate as the one in the *Iliad*.

65 Lines 8–9: *νηῶν / ἀρχελάων*—"the ships that were the spring of woe" and line 10: *ὠγυγίη*

beauty contest which took place on Mount Ida and which led to the Trojan War. Colluthus respects the rules of the epic composition in his proem and sums up in it all the episodes that follow in his poem.

The first episode of the story is the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. According to Homer, who does not describe the wedding itself but refers to it in *Iliad* 24.62, all the gods were present. So Colluthus omits none of the principal gods, not even Athena who was “untaught of marriage” (γάμων ἀδίδακτος) or Artemis, the other virgin goddess. The only uninvited was Eris, the goddess of strife, who became very angry and jealous.⁶⁶ Colluthus finds here a good opportunity to insert a simile—the only one of the poem: he compares Eris to a heifer which “wanders from the pasture in the glen and roams in the lonely brush, smitten by the bloody gadfly, the goad of kine” (ἡ δ’ ἄτε βησσήεντος ἀποπλαγχθεῖσα νομοῖο / πόρτις ἐρημαίησιν ἐνὶ ξυλόχοισιν ἀλᾶται / φοινήεντι μύωπι, βοῶν ἐλατήρι, τυπείσα, lines 41–43). Eris then throws a golden apple into the middle of the banquet and causes a great disturbance among the gods, as was her intention. Colluthus never forgets that his poem serves as an introductory poem to the *Iliad*; that is why he characterizes the golden apple as “the harbinger of war”, “the primal seed of turmoil” (πολέμοιο προάγγελον, [...] μόθου πρωτόσπορον ἀρχήν, lines 60 and 62).⁶⁷

At the end of this first episode, Zeus asks Hermes to find Paris, a young shepherd from Troy, and to command him to choose the fairest from among the three goddesses: Hera, Aphrodite and Athena. Although Hermes does not mention Zeus’ name when he gives the order to Paris (lines 127–130), Colluthus introduces here Διὸς βουλή—“Zeus’ will”, the key phrase of the whole *Iliad*, in an indirect and very subtle manner.

δὲ τίς ἔπλετο νείκεος ἀρχή—“what was the primeval beginning of the feud”. The Greek text is from Orsini (1972) and the English translation by Mair (1928).

66 It is very interesting that Colluthus describes Eris with the Homeric *hapax* ἀγέραςτος “unhonored”, a very strong term that Homer used it in the quarrel between Agamemnon and Achilles (*Il.* 1.119). Here the adjective underlines more the degree of the offense towards the goddess and her anger than the importance of the γέρας, which is a wedding invitation. Later on (line 53), Colluthus uses another Homeric strong epithet for Eris, ἀμαιμάκετος “invincible”, which is employed in the *Iliad* to describe horrible creatures, such as the Chimera (6.179 and 16.329).

67 We count already two allusions to the Homeric poems: line 19: Ζηνὸς ἐφημοσύνησιν ἐφνοχόει Γανυμήδης—“at the bidding of Zeus, Ganymede poured the wine” = *Il.* 20.232–234, and lines 34–35: οἶος δ’ οὐ κυνέην, οὐ δῆιον ἔγχος αἰέρων / ἐς δόμον Ἥφαιστοιο σιδήρεος ἔρχεται Ἄρης—“and iron Ares, even as, helmetless nor lifting warlike spear, he comes into the house of Hephaestus” = *Od.* 8.266–366.

On the way to meet Paris, the three goddesses prepare themselves before the beauty contest. Although they are already well dressed, as they have been at a wedding party, nevertheless they feel obliged to change again and to improve their looks in order to impress the judge. Aphrodite calls her children, the Erôtes, to fly to her assistance. She feels insecure when she compares herself with the other two goddesses who have power in war;⁶⁸ however, she is the absolute owner of the *χεστός*, her famous girdle with magical erotic powers, which she lends to Hera when the latter wants to accomplish the *Dios Apate*, in *Iliad*, 14.214–221.

The bucolic description of Paris is a tribute to Theocritus and to the *Homeric Hymn to Aphrodite*.⁶⁹ We have heard about the young shepherd before, from Zeus (lines 71–72) and Aphrodite (line 87), and now Colluthus presents him exactly as we imagined him:⁷⁰ abandoning his sheep and oxen to play his syrinx, an image not so different from an Iliadic one (18.523–526). We could compare this first impression to the one of Homeric Odysseus. We hear about him from the beginning of the *Odyssey* and when we see him for the first time, in 5.151, we find him doing exactly what we were told: crying by the beach.

The judgment of Paris is mentioned only once in the *Iliad*, in the last Book at 24.29–30.⁷¹ But for Colluthus, this is the heart of his poem. During the beauty contest, each one of the three goddesses talks to Paris in private and promises him a gift if he picks her: manly prowess in the war (Athena), kingship of all Asia and Europe (Hera), or *ἐρατὴν παράκοιτιν* “a lovely bride”: *Ἑλένης [...]* *λέκτρων* “the bed of Helen” (Aphrodite).⁷² The young Trojan does not hesitate one second in picking the last offer! So he gives Aphrodite the apple, “a plant *of war, of war* an evil seed” (*φυταλινὴν πολέμοιο, κακὴν πολέμοιο γενέθλην*, line 167).⁷³ With these words, the reader is reminded once more that the next poem he should read after this one is the *Iliad*.

Colluthus offers his own explanation for the hatred of Hera and Athena towards the people and the city of Troy. It is well known that they both lost

68 Aphrodite's vocabulary is highly military (lines 85–97): *διακρίνουσι*, *δειμαίνω*, *κοιρανίην*, *σκήπτρα*, *φυλάσσειν*, *πολέμων*, *ἀναλκις*, *ἔγχος ἀρήιον*, *βέλος ἔλκω*, *αἰχμῆς*, *θοδὸν ἔγχος*, *τόξον ἀείρω*, *θνήσκουσι*.

69 Cf. Apollonius of Rhodes 1.577–578. See also Jouan (1966) 100 and n. 5; Mackie (2013) 14 and n. 36.

70 According to Kotseleni (1990) 62–65 Paris is presented by Colluthus as an epic anti-hero.

71 Mackie (2013).

72 Hera's vocabulary is wholly Homeric (lines 148–152): *ἡγήτορα*, *κοίρανος*, *ἰφθίμοισι*, *αἰεὶ ἀριστεύουσιν*, *ὠκύμοροι*.

73 This repetition of *πολέμοιο* in the same verse is worth noting.

in the beauty contest, but in this poem, he presents Aphrodite as giving a gloating, mocking speech against the two goddesses, while she is holding in her hand "the prize of beauty that should work the ruin of a city" (πτολίπορθον ἀέθλιον, line 190). Colluthus also underlines that Athena, the "queen of handicraft" (ἐργασπόνοιο, line 194), refuses to help Paris with the building of his fleet (line 200: νῆας δ' οὐκ ἐνόησε καὶ οὐκ ἤσκησεν Ἀθήνη, "ships which Athena neither planned nor wrought") and that Aphrodite is now Paris' protector (line 202: λεχέων ἐπίκουρον ἐφespoμένην Ἀφροδίτην, "he had besought the favor of Aphrodite that attended him to aid his marriage").

Paris' fleet is built by Phereclus, according to the *Il.* 5.59–64. Colluthus exploits this information and underlines the connection between both poems by the use of the Homeric *hapax* ἀρχέκακος ("source of woe", line 196),⁷⁴ which is applied this time to Phereclus and not to the ships, as it has been above (line 9), and also by the characterization of Paris as Δύσπαρις ("unhappy Paris" or "Paris of ill omen", line 193), just as Homer calls him twice in the *Iliad* (3.39 and 13.769).

Paris' journey is very quick and full of Homeric formulae: Φθίη βωτιάνειρα καὶ εὐρύαγυια Μυκῆνη ("Phthia, feeder of men", "Mycene of wide streets", line 220 = *Il.* 1.155 and 4.52 respectively) and Σπάρτην καλλιγύναικα ("Sparta of fair women", line 222 = *Od.* 13.412). Even Colluthus' geography seems Homeric: he places Erymanthus (a mountain of Arcadia) near Sparta, because Erymanthus is found in the same Homeric verse with Taygetus, a mountain of Laconia (*Od.* 6.103).⁷⁵

Then follows the seduction of Helen, where she appears more like a heroine of the Hellenistic novels than of Homeric epic. Nevertheless, Colluthus uses Homeric reminiscences to compose this romantic episode of his poem. First, Paris is presented "glorying in his marvellous graces" (θεσπεσίησιν ἀγαλλόμενος χαρίτεσσιν, line 248)—Athena pours the same θεσπεσίην [...] χάριν "divine charm" on Telemachus before he meets the people of Ithaca and his mother's suitors, in *Od.* 2.12 and 17.63 respectively, and on Odysseus before he meets the Phaeacians, in *Od.* 8.19. Aphrodite may be responsible for this divine beautification of Paris in order to accomplish his cause. When Helen asks the young man to tell her who he is and where he comes from, the reader can only think of Arete, Alcinous' wife, when she asks Odysseus to talk about himself and his journey in *Od.* 7.237–239. And when Helen enumerates the heroes of Greece in lines 274–275, all the words and names Colluthus uses are found in Homer, in

74 For the Homeric idea of the ἀρχέκακοι νῆες see Jouan (1966) 179; Gärtner (2009) 25–28.

75 For more on Colluthus' geography, see Orsini (1972) xviii–xx; Kotseleni (1990) 246–247.

the same cases and metrical positions.⁷⁶ The episode closes with the description of the two gates of dreams, the one of truth and the other of deceit, which is an allusion to *Od.* 19.562–567, and with a reference to Helen as the “freight of war” (φόρτον [...] ἰωχμοῖο, line 325), another obvious connection to the *Iliad*.

The Hermione episode, the last one of the poem, is an original contribution of Colluthus.⁷⁷ Hermione, the only daughter of Menelaus and Helen, is mentioned by name only once in *Od.* 4.14. Homer refers to her also in *Il.* 3.175 and in *Od.* 4.263. The little child is hopeless after her mother abandoned her so suddenly and inexplicably. She had slept in her parents’ bed the previous night and now she cannot find her. Hermione falls asleep in tears, just like Penelope does in *Od.* 4.793–794,⁷⁸ and dreams of her mother, who reveals to her that a deceitful man had come to their house and carried her away. The girl wakes up and calls to the birds to go find her father in Crete and tell him all about the abduction of Helen (lines 381–384): ἡερίης, ὄρνιθες, εὐπτερα τέκνα γενέθλης, / ἔσπετε νοστήσαντες ἐπὶ Κρήτην Μενελάω· / χθιζὸν ἐπὶ Σπάρτην τις ἀνὴρ ἀθεμίστιος ἐλθὼν / ἀγλαῖην ξύμπασαν ἑὼν⁷⁹ ἀλάπαξε μελάρων—“Birds, winged children of the brood of air, go ye to Crete, and say to Menelaus: ‘Yesterday a lawless man came to Sparta and hath laid waste all the glory of thy halls!’”⁸⁰ It seems to me that the meeting point between the two poems, Colluthus’ and the *Iliad*, are these words of Hermione, since Paris is now characterized as ἀθεμίστιος—“lawless”, and must be punished in some way.

The journey back to Troy is described in six verses. A Cassandra both Aeschylean and Triphiodorean watches the two lovers enter the city, pulls her hair out and throws away her golden veil.⁸¹ Colluthus closes his poem with the same word he opens it: the Homeric *hapax* ἀρχέκακος—“source of woe” (lines 392 and 8), which is now applied to Paris himself.

76 Ruiz Pérez (2004) 346–348.

77 Toohey (1992) 214. For the similarities between Colluthus and Nonnus, *Dion.*, XLVII, 34–264, see Orsini (1972) XXIII–XXVI; Cuartero i Iborra (2003) 194–195; Harries (2006) 545–547; Spanoudakis (2007) 89–90; Magnelli (2008) 171, n. 81.

78 Cf. also Colluthus’ mention to Sleep’s relationship with Death (line 364) and *Il.* 14.231, 16.454, 16.672, *Od.* 13.79–80.

79 I prefer Brodeau’s emendation on the manuscripts’ ἐμὼν.

80 For the direct speech, see Elderkin (1906) 11, 22.

81 Ypsilanti (2007) 110–111, n. 39. According to Paschalis (2008) 144 “Cassandra should be envisaged as *beginning the lamentations* for the end of Troy”.

Conclusions

"Texts like the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* [...] are constantly remade in new contexts to serve different cultural agendas."⁸² The poets of Upper Egypt in the first centuries of the Byzantine era knew Homer by heart. They imitated his language, his style, and his expressions; they analysed his scenes and similes; they even played with the Homeric text.⁸³ If they wanted their names to last for eternity, they had to be associated with Homer. Triphiodorus and Colluthus succeeded in seeing theirs connected to the Homeric poems, since they both realized their ambition to complete the *Iliad*.⁸⁴

In the 3rd century AD, Triphiodorus composed a poem of 691 lines in the Homeric style.⁸⁵ Drawing his material from both Homeric poems and exploiting the frame of the Demodocus' song (*Od.* 8.499–520), he continued the *Iliad* by narrating the last three days of the war of Troy.⁸⁶ On the other hand, in the 6th century AD, Colluthus decided to describe the causes of the legendary war, by composing a much shorter poem.⁸⁷ *The Rape of Helen* is basically a sequence of detached episodes whose importance resides in narrating how it all started, from the marriage of Peleus and Thetis to the abduction of Helen. Both poems continue the *Iliad* in their own way, without copying, imitating, or parodying it. Both poets are aware of their (limited) poetic skills, so they avoid ridicule through a comparison with Homer. Over the last few years, we are pleased to see commentaries and studies on these two texts. Triphiodorus and Colluthus added their contribution to the Greek literature with great respect towards the long epic tradition. This is the proof that they accomplished their journey to literary eternity.⁸⁸

82 Tomasso (2012) 374.

83 Like the *Lipogrammatic Iliad* of Nestor of Laranda and the *Lipogrammatic Odyssey* of Triphiodorus, both lost now.

84 Orsini (1969) 13. See also Griffin (2010) 29: "These poems filled in the beginning and the end of the Trojan War, which the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* has so unaccountably omitted to describe, in a manner as 'Homeric' as their authors could manage."

85 That is a little longer than an average Book of the *Iliad*: Tomasso (2012) 382.

86 Cuartero (1988) 55 calls *The Sack of Troy* "a simple exercise of poetic and rhetoric ingenuity." See also Tomasso (2012) 408: "Triphiodorus takes up a literary challenge suggested in the *Iliad* itself."

87 *The Rape of Helen* has the same length as the twentieth Book of the *Odyssey*.

88 My thanks go to Robert Simms for inviting me to contribute to this volume and making many useful suggestions for its improvement, and to my dear friend and colleague Sophia Kapetanaki for her invaluable help with my English.

Bibliography

- Agosti, G. (2012) "Greek Poetry," in Johnson (2012) 361–404.
- Alsina, J. (1972) "Panorama de la épica griega tardía," *Estudios Clásicos* 65: 139–169.
- Alsina Clota, J. (1957) "Helena de Troya. Historia de un mito," *Helmantica* 27: 373–394.
- Amato, E., Gaucher-Rémond, E., and Scafoglio, G. (eds) (2014) *Variations sur le mythe: la légende de Troie de l'Antiquité Tardive au Moyen Age. Variantes, innovations, modifications et réécritures. Atlantide 2*: <http://atlantide.univ-nantes.fr>.
- Angelis, D. (2005) *Ἰδεολογικά ρεύματα τῆς Ὑστερης Ἀρχαιότητος*. Athens.
- Bagnall, R.S. (ed.) (2007) *Egypt in the Byzantine World, 300–700: portrayal of the history, society, economy, culture, religious life*. Cambridge.
- Bates, C. (ed.) (2010) *The Cambridge Companion to the Epic*. Cambridge.
- Baumbach, M., and Bär, S. (eds) (2012a) *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Epyllion and Its Reception*. Leiden.
- Baumbach, M., and Bär, S. (2012b) "A Short Introduction to the Ancient Epyllion," in Baumbach and Bär (2012a) IX–XVI.
- Brioso, M., and González Ponce, F.J. (eds) (1996) *Las letras griegas bajo el Imperio*. Sevilla.
- Brioso Sánchez, M. (1996) "Los proemios en la épica griega de época imperial," in Brioso and González Ponce (1996) 55–133.
- Brioso Sánchez, M. (1999) "La épica griega en la Antigüedad tardía (siglos III–VII d.C.)," in González (1999) 11–46.
- Calderón, E., Morales, A., and Valverde, M. (eds) (2006) *Κοινὸς λόγος. Homenaje al profesor José García López*. Murcia.
- Cameron, A. (1965) "Wandering Poets: A Literary Movement in Byzantine Egypt," *Historia* 14: 470–509.
- Cameron, A. (2007) "Poets and pagans in Byzantine Egypt," in Bagnall (2007) 21–46.
- Carvounis, K., and Hunter, R. (eds) (2008) *Signs of Life? Studies in Later Greek Poetry = Ramus* 37.
- Cuartero, F.J. (1988) *Trifiodor, La Presa de Troia. Text revisat i traducció*. Barcelona.
- Cuartero i Iborra, F.J. (1992) *Col-lut, El Rapte d'Hèlena. Text revisat i traducció*. Barcelona.
- Cuartero i Iborra, F.J. (2003) "Mitos en Nono de Panópolis y otros poetas del Alto Egipto," in López Férez (2003) 175–195.
- Elderkin, G.W. (1906) *Aspects of the Speech in the Later Greek Epic*. Baltimore.
- Fantuzzi, M., and Papanghelis, T. (eds) (2006) *Brill's Companion to Greek and Latin Pastoral*. Leiden.
- García Pinilla, I.J., and Talavera Cuesta, S. (eds) (2004) *Charisterion Francisco Martín García oblatum*. Cuenca.

- Gärtner, U. (2009) "Νῆες ἀρχέαλοι. Schiffe als Unheilsbringer in der antiken Literatur," *Antike und Abendland* 55: 23–44.
- Garzya, A. (1987–1988) "Gli antichi generi poetici nella tarda antichità," *Annali della Facoltà di Lettere e Filosofia dell'Università di Napoli* 18: 239–260.
- Gerlaud, B. (1982) *Triphiodore, La prise d'Ilion*. Paris.
- González, J. (ed.) (1999) *El mundo Mediterráneo (siglos III–VII): actas del III Congreso Andaluz de Estudios Clásicos*. Madrid.
- Griffin, J. (2010) "Greek Epic," in Bates (2010) 13–30.
- Harries, B. (2006) "The Drama of Pastoral in Nonnus and Colluthus," in Fantuzzi and Papanghelis (2006) 515–548.
- Hernández de la Fuente, D. (2004) "Lecturas de Sófocles en el Egipto tardoantiguo," in Pérez Jiménez, Alcalde Martín, and Caballero Sánchez (2004) 393–402.
- Hollis, A. (2006) "The Hellenistic Epyllion and Its Descendants," in Johnson (2006) 141–157.
- Jeffreys, E. (2006) "Writers and Audiences in the Early Sixth Century," in Johnson (2006) 127–139.
- Johnson, S.F. (ed.) (2006) *Greek Literature in Late Antiquity: Dynamism, Didacticism, Classicism*. Aldershot.
- Johnson, S.F. (ed.) (2012) *The Oxford Handbook of Late Antiquity*. Oxford.
- Jouan, F. (1966) *Euripide et les légendes des Chants Cypriens. Des origines de la guerre de Troie à l'Iliade*. Paris.
- Karavas, O. (2014) "'Nymphes de Troade, racontez-moi comment tout a commencé': les déviations de Collouthos par rapport à la légende troyenne," in Amato, Gaucher-Rémond, and Scafoglio (2014).
- Kim, L. (2010) *Homer between History and Fiction in Imperial Greek Literature*. Cambridge-New York.
- Kotseleni, S. (1990) *Colluthus, The Rape of Helen, A Stylistic Commentary*. Diss. London.
- López Férez, J.A. (ed.) (2003) *Mitos en la literatura griega helenística e imperial*. Madrid.
- Mackie, C.J. (2013) "Iliad 24 and the Judgement of Paris," *Classical Quarterly* 63: 1–16.
- Magnelli, E. (2008) "Colluthus' 'Homeric' Epyllion," in Carvounis and Hunter (2008) 151–172.
- Mair, A.W. (1928) *Oppian, Colluthus and Tryphiodorus. Edited with an English Translation*. Cambridge, MA.
- Miguélez Caverro, L. (2008) *Poems in Context: Greek Poetry in the Egyptian Thebaid 200–600 AD*. Berlin.
- Miguélez Caverro, L. (2013) *Triphiodorus, The Sack of Troy: A General Study and a Commentary*. Berlin-Boston.
- Montes Cala, J.G. (1989) "La invocación de Calíope en Trifiodoro: nota de crítica textual y literaria," *Habis* 20: 25–31.

- Murray, A.T. (1919) *Homer, Odyssey, Books 1–12. Translated by A.T. Murray*. Cambridge, MA.
- Murray, A.T. (1924) *Homer, Iliad, Books 1–12. Translated by A.T. Murray*. Cambridge, MA.
- Orsini, P. (1969) “De Nonnos à Collouthos,” *Pallas* 16: 13–24.
- Orsini, P. (1972) *Collouthos, L’enlèvement d’Hélène*. Paris.
- Orsini, P. (1974) “Tryphiodore et la μίμησις,” *Pallas* 21: 3–12.
- Paschalis, M. (2008) “*The Abduction of Helen: A Reappraisal*,” in Carvounis and Hunter (2008) 136–150.
- Pérez Jiménez, A., Alcalde Martín, C., and Caballero Sánchez, R. (eds) (2004) *Sófocles el hombre, Sófocles el poeta. Actas del Congreso internacional con motivo del xxv centenario del nacimiento de Sófocles (497/496 a.C.-2003/4), celebrado en Málaga, 29–31 de mayo de 2003*. Málaga.
- Ruiz Pérez, A. (2004) “Historia editorial del *Rapto de Helena* de Coluto,” in García Pinilla and Talavera Cuesta (2004) 339–361.
- Sánchez Martínez, F. (2006) “El rapto de Helena en la literatura grecorromana,” in Calderón, Morales, and Valverde (2006) 953–962.
- Spanoudakis, K. (2007) “Icarius Jesus Christ? Dionysiac Passion and Biblical Narrative in Nonnus’ Icarius Episode (*Dion.* 47, 1–264),” *Wiener Studien* 120: 35–92.
- Tomasso, V. (2012) “The fast and the furious: Thriphiodorus’ reception of Homer in the *Capture of Troy*,” in Baumbach and Bär (2012a) 371–409.
- Toohey, P. (1992) *Reading Epic. An Introduction to the Ancient Narratives*. London.
- Ypsilanti, M. (2007) “Triphiodorus Homericus. People in Ἰλίου Ἀλωσις and their forebears in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*,” *Wiener Studien* 120: 93–114.

Program and Poetics in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*

Calum A. Maciver

Epic continuation is a phrase which sums up exactly the nature of Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*. There is, arguably, no work surviving from antiquity which so models itself on the great epic archetypes, the Homeric poems. Not only is the *Posthomerica* Homeric (or, hyper-Homeric) in its every aspect, from language and formulaic composition, to imagery, plot sequences, and narrative functions, the poem explicitly marks itself out as Homeric. In this chapter I will survey first the ways in which the *Posthomerica* not only appears as, but asserts itself as, Homeric. As the focus of the chapter, I will discuss a number of short but important scenes which, meta-poetically, encode the epic distance the *Posthomerica* has from Homer, and which, therefore, bespeak the imitative program which Quintus, as a poet of the Imperial period, creates to *continue* Homer on the verges of Late Antiquity.

Greek Epic of the Imperial Period

The *Posthomerica* is a fourteen-book epic poem in Homeric-imitative Greek, which narrates the events of the Trojan War from the death of Hector to the eventual departure of the victorious Greeks.¹ Its account therefore includes episodes such as the deaths of Achilles and Ajax; of Penthesileia, Memnon, and Paris; the *hoplon krisis*; and the sack of Troy by means, principally, of the deception of the wooden horse (a series not found elsewhere in a single narrative poem). Thus the Latin translation *Posthomerica* of the Greek title τὰ μεθ' Ὀμήρου ("the things after Homer") is an accurate description of the contents of the epic, contents which neatly fill the gap in events left largely un-narrated by the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*. It is no accident that three of the extant MSS. of the *Posthomerica* were found situated between MSS. of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*—the early transmission of the text, therefore, was already an interpretative reception, namely, that the *Posthomerica* was a suitable means for

1 In this section, most of my discussion is derived from Maciver (2012a) 2–6. See, also, Vian (1963) vii–liii and Baumbach and Bär (2007) 1–26.

bridging the gap in plots of the two more famous epics.² The *praenomen* Quintus (“Kointos” in Greek) is found in some of the MSS. headings, and the epithet “of Smyrna” is taken from the only seemingly autobiographical information we have in the poem, in the in-proem (12.306–313, discussed below),³ where the narrator states that he was found by the Muses as he tended his sheep on the plains of Smyrna. We know nothing about Quintus of Smyrna apart from what the *Posthomerica* can tell us itself, which, too, is virtually nothing. Current consensus is that Quintus wrote the *Posthomerica* sometime in the third century A.D.⁴ This date is essentially insecure, based as it is on a number of exiguous factors. In the first place, for Triphiodorus, who wrote a short *epyllion* called *The Sack of Troy*, which engages the *Posthomerica* extensively, and who (therefore) post-dates Quintus, there exists a papyrus fragment (*POxy.* 2946) which can be dated positively to the late third century A.D.⁵ Apparent allusions to Oppian’s *Halieutica*—a work which can be firmly dated to the late second century—have been taken by scholars to prove Quintus’ dependence on Oppian, the earlier poet.

There are a number of (more far-fetched) dating criteria which I will pass over.⁶ What is clear is that Quintus wrote at a time when epic poetry of a large scale was flourishing. We know, for example, of the massive 60 book epic on world history written by Pisander of Laranda, earlier in the third century. And if we include the evidence of papyri fragments of epic poetry for this period, what we have surviving is most likely only the tip of the iceberg.⁷ There

2 Further discussion at Maciver (2012a) 7–9.

3 Tzetzes, the Byzantine scholar and poet, was the first to apply this epithet (cf. Vian (1963) vii–viii).

4 Detailed discussion in Bär (2009) 14–23, James (2004) xvii–xxi, and Gärtner (2005), 23–26.

5 Opinion is not unified among scholars on the indebtedness of Triphiodorus to Quintus, rather than the other way round: see, most recently, Tomasso (2012) 372–373 (who discusses scholarship to date on the issue). The proem of Triphiodorus, with its clear polemical distancing from the *Posthomerica*, demonstrably, in my opinion, points to its post-dating of Quintus (a point I discuss in an article (in-progress) on Triphiodorus).

6 Details in Maciver (2012a) 4–6. Most recently, the papyrus which relates the *Vision of Dorotheus* (*PBodm.* 29), published in 1984, has been argued to have implications for our identification of Quintus. The fragmentary poem, in two places, refers to Dorotheus the son of Quintus (the poet), and recent scholarship has tentatively suggested that this poet is Quintus of Smyrna. The papyrus can be securely dated to around 400 A.D., and may be another firm *terminus ante quem*. As I have shown elsewhere (Maciver (2012a) 4–5, with further bibliographical details), two isolated mentions of a poet called Quintus cannot definitively be taken to refer to Quintus of Smyrna.

7 Schubert (2007) 343, and *passim*. for further discussion.

was clearly an audience for large-scale epic on mythological themes (we can compare, two centuries later, the 48-book *Dionysiaca* of Nonnus). The majority of scholarship on the *Posthomérica* assumes that the presumed loss of the Epic Cycle (the series of epics on Trojan and Theban sagas of the later archaic period, which survive now in only fragmentary form) by the time of the third century A.D. gave Quintus his reason for composing the *Posthomérica*, namely, to fill in the gap left by this loss. However, there is no strong evidence to suggest that Quintus did not have access to the Epic Cycle; and furthermore, a poet does not need, as a ground for composition, the idea of replacement, in any era—and in the era of Quintus, it has already been seen that there was an appetite for large-scale epic.⁸

A big book is, famously, a big evil, according to Callimachus (fr. 465 Pfeiffer), but not only did Quintus write a fourteen-book epic, he wrote on the Trojan War,⁹ betraying the strictures of the slender Muse (*Aetia* 1.24 Pfeiffer).¹⁰ Despite its anachronistic style, which closely mimics the formulaic system found in Homer, the *Posthomérica* is nevertheless a literary, post-Hellenistic epic poem.¹¹ It is caught within a long series of evolutions in which Homer was recast and developed. Outwardly, the *Posthomérica* cannot be termed Callimachean or Alexandrian, but as epithets so often applied to Latin poetry to signal their allusive cleverness and demands upon a learned readership, they are not wholly out of place in describing the *Posthomérica*. The reader will not find widespread Alexandrian traits (as one would, to a greater extent, find in other Imperial Greek poems such as the *ps.*-Oppian *Cynegetica* or Triphiodorus), but Quintus not only signals his indebtedness to Callimachus, but includes so-called Alexandrian footnotes occasionally in his poem.¹² Thus, Quintus is writing grand epic which also demands a learned readership, a reader characterized as a *pepaideumenos*—a term used to describe those who had the *paideia* which marked the period often termed the Second Sophistic.

8 Full discussion and references on the Epic Cycle problem can be found in Maciver (2012a) 8–9.

9 Contrast Callimachus' disapprobation of such choices for epics, *Anth. Pal.* 12.43 (fr. 28 Pfeiffer).

10 Vian (1963) xl argues that not only is Quintus' epic not Callimachean, but rather is one that combats the very notion propounded by Callimachus.

11 The *Posthomérica* neatly fits Hainsworth's definition of literary epic (1991), 9: "a 'sentimental' revival of the Homeric form of epic."

12 For Quintus' relationship with Alexandrian poetry, and especially Apollonius of Rhodes, see Maciver (2012a) 14–16 and (2012b) *passim*. On Alexandrianism generally in Quintus, see Bär (2009) 12, 62, 57, and 77.

Homeric Continuation: Programmatic Readings of the *Posthomerica*

The *Posthomerica* begins exactly at the point at which the *Iliad* finishes:

εὖθ' ὑπὸ Πηλείωνι δάμη θεοείκελος Ἑκτωρ
καί ἐ πυρὴ κατέδαψε καὶ ὀστέα γαῖα κεκεύθει,
δὴ τότε Τρῶες ἔμμινον ἀνὰ Πριάμοιο πόλῃα
δειδιότες μένος ἢ ὕ θρασύφρονος Αἰακίδαο.¹³

After godlike Hector had been slain by the son of Peleus, and the pyre had consumed him and the earth covered his bones, the Trojans then stayed stuck inside Priam's city in fear of the noble strength of that brave descendant of Aeacus.

Posthomerica 1.1–4

The *Posthomerica* begins with a conjunction, not, as is usually the case for an epic poem, with a proem.¹⁴ A conjunction links two co-ordinating sentences, and the topic of the first two lines of the poem is the final main action of the *Iliad*: Hector has been slain by Achilles, and his bones have been laid to rest. The “when” of εὖτε is, therefore, books 22–24 of the *Iliad*. No aims or rehearsals of the *Posthomerica*'s poetical ambition or content is given, but instead the reader is lead straight to the next point in the essentially Iliadic story: the Trojans remained in Troy in fear of Achilles. Thus, the title of the poem, translated most appositely by Vian in his edition of the poem—“La Suite d'Homère”—reflects precisely its nature: this is a sequel.¹⁵ Quintus defies typical epic practice by beginning untypically. As a result, the reader is compelled to dig more deeply for poetological significations. Without dwelling further on these opening lines (a closer intertextual reading can be found elsewhere),¹⁶ I will move instead to the most problematic passage in the poem, the in-proem of book 12, where the narrator describes his poetic initiation.¹⁷ The decision to share apparently

13 The text of the *Posthomerica* is taken from Vian's magisterial Budé edition (1963–1969).

14 Fuller discussion on the programmatic implications of this lack of proem can be found in Maciver (2012a) 27–33.

15 Vian (1963–1969). On the poem as a sequel, and this conjunction as the link to the *Iliad*, see, further, Schenk (1997) 377, Keydell (1965) 1273, and Bär (2007) 32–33.

16 Bär (2007) 32–40 and Maciver (2012a) 27–33.

17 For discussion and summary of positions, see, most recently, Maciver (2012a) 33–37 and (2012b) 64–68, and Bär (2007).

autobiographical details occurs just before the list of heroes who enter the wooden horse (12.314–330), perhaps one of the key climaxes of the poem. Given the variations in antiquity in accounts of who actually entered the wooden horse, Quintus seeks the authority of the Muses, most likely to affirm that he is giving *the* definitive account.

τούς μοι νῦν καθ' ἕκαστον ἀνειρομένῳ σάφα, Μοῦσαι,
 ἔσπεθ' ὅσοι κατέβησαν ἔσω πολυχανδέος ἵππου·
 ὑμεῖς γάρ πάσαν μοι ἐνὶ φρεσὶ θήκατ' αἰοδὴν,
 πρὶν μοι (ἔτ') ἀμφὶ παρειὰ κατασκίδνασθαι ἴουλον,
 Σμύρνης ἐν δαπέδοισι περικλυτὰ μῆλα νέμοντι
 τρίς τόνον Ἑρμοῦ ἄπωθεν ὅσον βοόωντος ἀκοῦσαι,
 Ἄρτεμιδος περὶ νηὸν Ἑλευθερίῳ ἐνὶ κήπῳ,
 οὔρῃ οὔτε λίγν χθαμαλῶ οὔθ' ὑψόθι πολλῶ.

Tell me now plainly, you Muses, in answer to my plea, who each of the heroes were who entered inside the cavernous horse. For you inspired me with all my song, before the soft down had spread over my youthful cheeks, as I shepherded my excellent flocks on the plains of Smyrna—three times as far from Hermos as a man's voice carries, around the temple of Artemis in the garden of Freedom, on a mountain neither too low nor too high.¹⁸

Posthomerica 12.306–313

This is the only invocation of the Muses in all fourteen books of the *Posthomerica*, and the only time the primary narrator refers to himself (μοι). A number of intertexts play into the meaning of this passage. The clearest is the Muse invocation at the beginning of Hesiod's *Theogony* (22–28), where the Hesiodic narrator similarly speaks of his inspiration from the Muses as he tended his sheep on Helicon. *Iliad* 2.484–492, which also precedes an invocation, is also a strong influence, as is Callimachus *Aetia* 1 fr. 2.¹⁹ Thus the epic heritage of the *Posthomerica* is marked by the *Iliad*, and nuanced by the Hesiodic influence, a

18 Unfortunately, it is unclear what the significance of the temple of Artemis in the garden of Freedom is—it most likely contains further meta-poetical significance but lack of knowledge of intertexts or of what is symbolized makes further discussion impossible (for attempts at interpretation, see Bär (2007) 57–59).

19 The allusion is in the words μῆλα νέμοντι to ποιμένι μῆλα at *Aetia* 1. fr. 2.1. On the meta-poetical significance of the Callimachean intertext as a window allusion to Hesiod, see Maciver (2012b) 66–68.

didactic epic. Quintus' epic is marked by repeated gnomic statements, in both primary and secondary narration,²⁰ which lend a strong ethical dimension to the text.²¹ The Callimachean intertext, in such a programmatic passage, signals the Hellenistic lens through which these archaic texts are received, and also to the learned reading background which the *Posthomerica* demands. This is a "Homeric" ethic of specific learning, marked by specific didactic characteristics.

At second glance, however, the intertextual indications are complemented by a further program. Why does the narrator include the superfluous detail that he was shepherding his flocks on a mountain that was neither too low nor too high (line 313)? Hopkinson was the first to suggest that this line connotes the *style* of Quintus' poetry, namely that it appropriates a middle way that "avoids extremes", one that is "neither sublime nor pedestrian" and which produces "modest innovation within traditional parameters."²² Hopkinson's original inclination to see more behind this line than the literal is surely correct. Not only is there nothing in this account which allows us to adduce autobiography for Quintus,²³ but each detail should be considered carefully for further, symbolic implications. This line designates poetic style and methodology,²⁴ but as I have argued elsewhere, *pace* James,²⁵ the point of inspiration takes place *while* this shepherd is engaged in shepherding on a hill neither too low nor too high, that is, engaged in other poetic activities before taking on the new challenge of composing epic.²⁶ Of these other poetic endeavours, whether published or not, we know nothing. Until now, the vocabulary used to describe this mountain has not been examined. The three styles of oratory, as set out in the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 4.10, *gravis*, *mediocris*, and *ad tenuata*, or the four styles of prose writing, as discussed by Demetrius *On Style* 36–37, ἰσχνός, μεγαλοπρεπής, γλαφυρός, δεινός (plain, elevated, elegant, forcible),²⁷ cannot be applied to epic

20 Full discussion in Maciver (2012a) 87–123.

21 See my discussion below of the shield of Achilles in *Posthomerica* 5.

22 All Hopkinson (1994) 106.

23 For the opposite view, esp. that of James (2004) xviii, see Bär (2007) 52–55, where he discusses scholarship to date on the issue.

24 Against this view, cf. the insistent contestation of James (2004) xviii, with which see the discussion of Bär (2007) 59–60.

25 (2004) xviii.

26 Maciver (2012a) 36.

27 As translated by Roberts (1902), ad loc. Demetrius is keen to insist on the mixing of all four styles as more the norm in composition (37). On the three styles, see Rowe (1997) 155, and cf. Kennedy (1994) 89.

poetry, which of course is an entirely different medium. As Quintus is closely imitating Homeric style, he has chosen the grandest of all vehicles of expression. Although sublimity, *hypsos*, is the subject of the *ps.*-Longinus discourse, flatness as an expression for style is not used by the rhetoricians, and signifies, rather, something purely physical.²⁸ The word for lofty, too, has a poetic pedigree in Homer (for example, *Iliad* 10.16, of Zeus' throne). Quintus has not chosen vocabulary which should alert the reader to the possibility of received categories of style, and thus the case for this particular poem as bracketed by the author as of a middle *style*, becomes all the less likely. This line is instead a modest type of *recusatio*, where the narrator states he was dabbling in lesser things when the call to write epic poetry came: technical it is not.²⁹

We learn, therefore, nothing about Quintus either from the in-proem or opening of the poem. Both promote the conceit that this is a Homeric poem, and that we should take this one step further. This is still the *Iliad*, and the narrator is still the "same" as the one who originally narrated the *Iliad*. The *PosthomERICA* is positioned as a smooth run-on from the epic archetype, and its extreme imitation of Homeric language and style is such simply because this *is*, we are to interpret, still Homer. There is nothing in the in-proem, on the level of the narration itself, which could not describe the historically-received picture of Homer: Smyrna was of course one of the reputed birth-places of Homer in antiquity.³⁰ Similarly, the lack of a proem at the beginning of the poem is designed to be seen as a seamless transition from the *Iliad*.

This is, therefore, a continuation of the epic of all epics, only more than ten centuries later. As a result, all identifiable differences in thematic and ethical presentation stand out starkly within the overlying Homeric framework. This potential for emblematic difference, bespeaking *belatedness*, is seen in epitome in the poem's ecphrastic representation of the shield of Achilles in *PosthomERICA* 5.³¹ The shield described (5.6–101), just before the contest for it between Ajax and Odysseus (5.123–321),³² is ostensibly exactly the same shield as that described in *Iliad* 18, and given to Achilles at the beginning of *Iliad* 19, but the details on the shield in both the post-Homeric and Iliadic descriptions are dif-

28 Interestingly, it is used only here in Quintus.

29 Cf. the famous Vergilian *recusatio* at *Eclogue* 6.1–4, with the discussion of Thomas (1985) 61–63. On epic and rhetoric in this type of Imperial poetry, see Schubert (2007) 345–347.

30 See Graziosi (2002) 73–79 for discussion and further references to ancient sources.

31 For the shield of Achilles in the *PosthomERICA*, see Maciver (2012a) 39–86, and Maciver (2007). Important discussion can also be found in Baumbach (2007).

32 On this contest, see, most recently, Maciver (2012c).

ferent.³³ How can one and the same shield be described differently, especially in an epic which promotes itself as *still* the *Iliad*. These differences, therefore, take on an emblematic value for understanding the differences between the *Posthomeric* and *Iliad* on the macro level.³⁴ The structure of the ecphrasis in the *Posthomeric* follows overall that of the shield in the *Iliad*—both open with a cosmological summary, both demarcate sections on peace and war, and both contain arable scenes.³⁵ At the beginning of the scenes of peace, the narrator describes a mountain of *Arete*.

αἰπύτατον δ' ἐτέτυκτο θεοκμήτῳ ἐπὶ ἔργῳ
καὶ τρηχὺ ζαθέης Ἀρετῆς ὄρος· ἐν δὲ καὶ αὐτὴ
εἰστήκει φοίνικος ἐπεμβεβαῖα κατ' ἄκρης
ὑψηλὴ ψάουσα πρὸς οὐρανόν. ἀμφὶ δὲ πάντῃ
ἀτραπιτοὶ θαμέεσσι διεργόμεναι σκολόπεσσιν
ἀνθρώπων ἀπέρυκον ἐν πάτον, οὖνεκα πολλοὶ
εἰσοπίσω χάζοντο τεθηπότες αἰπὰ κέλευθα,
παῦροι δ' ἱερὸν οἶμον ἀνήιον ἰδρώνοντες.

And highest of all on that divinely-crafted work was the rugged mountain of sacred Arete. It stood there mounted on top of a palm-tree reaching up to heaven. And pathways all round, made inaccessible with dense thorn bushes, kept men back from the sacred way. That is why many would shrink back in awe of the sheer paths, and only a few—toiling up—climbed the holy path.³⁶

Posthomeric 5.49–56

There is nothing like this on the shield of Achilles in the *Iliad*. This mountain is given the most prominent place on the shield: it is highest (line 49). The originality of the depiction—namely, that it was built by Hephaestus at the very beginning—is suggested by the emphasis on the divine craftsmanship (line 49: θεοκμήτῳ ἐπὶ ἔργῳ). This is both the most important image in the

33 As Katerina Carvounis (Athens) points out to me, in both Quintus and Nonnus the shield descriptions, games, and theomachies, despite (or because of?) their pointed Homeric heritage, are the most markedly different (non-Homeric) parts of each epic.

34 Adapting, broadly, the discussion at Maciver (2012a) 42–48.

35 Quint. Smyrn. 5.6–16 (cosmology based on *Iliad* 18.483–489), 17–42 (scenes of war based on *Iliad* 18.509–540), 43–44 (the demarcation is explicitly given), and then 45–96 (varied scenes of peace based on the city at peace at *Iliad* 18.490–508).

36 In discussing this scene, I build upon arguments found first in Maciver (2007).

description, and one the reader is to envisage as devised by Hephaestus in the construction of the shield (reported in *Iliad* 18). Homer, we are to conclude, did not include all of the scenes on the shield in the narration of its making in the *Iliad*: Quintus himself leads the reader to this conclusion. The narrator at *Posthomerica* 5.97–98 states that there were countless other scenes depicted on the shield by Hephaestus.³⁷ Quintus' narrator, like Homer's, has access to all of the scenes on the shield, but is selective. Moreover, we should understand that the narrator of the archaic *Iliad* read the shield as an archaic reader, just as the post-Homeric narrator read the countless scenes, and described some of them, as a post-Homeric reader with later cultural expectations.³⁸ The mountain of *Arete* is obviously loaded with allegorical meaning. As I have argued elsewhere, the image is first and foremost Hesiodic, but because of a number of important intratexts within the *Posthomerica*, has a strong stoic significance too.³⁹ Quintus' narrator may strive to make this image Homeric, as discussed above, but the image is non-Homeric nevertheless. By placing this ethical symbol on the most emblematic of devices, a shield, and the most Homeric of devices, the shield of *Achilles*, Quintus overlays later, stoic-influenced morality onto archaic, non-stoic representations. This is how Quintus reads Homer: an Imperial poet, but one who is re-focusing Imperial readers' attention on ethical aspects of the *Iliad*, now with a more modern ethical dimension (as presented by Quintus in the *Posthomerica*). Quintus enlarges and alters what was apparently originally in Homer, despite the epic's seemingly Iliadic continuation.⁴⁰

The Marks of Lateness

I would like to examine for the first time, in the remainder of this chapter, two other sections of the poem which have an important meta-poetical bear-

37 ἄλλα δὲ μυρία κείτο κατ' ἀσπίδα τεχνηέντως / χερσὶν ὑπ' ἀθανάτης πυκινόφρονος Ἡφαίστιο (5.97–98).

38 See Maciver (2012a) 47–48 for the problems and solutions in reading originality via these two lines.

39 Maciver (2007) 263–267 and for the intratexts, 267–277. The key intertext is Hesiod *Op.* 287–292. I use stoic with lower case “s” as Quintus' Stoicism is most likely an admixture of Cynic, (neo-)Pythagorean and later Stoic thought. See Maciver (2014, forthcoming) and the seminal article on the mountain of *Arete* by Byre (1982).

40 On “reading Quintus reading Homer”, and specifically for the act of reading elicited by the *Posthomerica*, see Maciver (2012a) 7–13.

ing on Quintus' epic belatedness: Nestor's song (book 4) and Niobe's lament (book 1). The latter scene appropriates a pivotal Homeric moment which is then applied in very different post-Homeric context. Nestor's song, however, acts as a narrative device to overcome the information gaps left by the lack of a proem.

Nestor's role in the *Iliad* as wise councillor with a wealth of experience is developed a step further in the *Posthomeric*: he becomes very much the mouth-piece for the poem's moralizing,⁴¹ and reflects or expands upon, on many levels, the wisdom-sayings delivered in the primary narration.⁴² One of the most famous examples of this role is his consolatory advice about the nature of life and death to the grieving Podaleirius in book 6,⁴³ advice (esp. 7.66–95) which acts as an exposition of much of the primary narration's statements on fate and the afterlife.⁴⁴ He is also marked out and respected by his fellow Achaeans as a knower of old myths (8.480: παλαιῶν ἱστορί μύθων), and for that he is obeyed. These old myths (in that speech in *Posthomeric* 8) happen to be actual events already narrated in the *Iliad* (specifically, the prophecy of Calchas about the fall of Troy, *Iliad* 2.299–330). Nestor knows his *Iliad*, and expects the same from his audience: he is both a *mise-en-abîme* of the poet Quintus and also a symbol of the ideal reader of Homer (which essentially is what Quintus himself is, as reflected in his readings of the *Iliad* in his own poem).⁴⁵ As the first part of the games in honour of Achilles in *Posthomeric* 4, Nestor rises to sing an *encomium* of Thetis the prize giver, and includes in his song both her wedding feast and a summary of the great exploits of her son Achilles. His speech on one level acts as a recapitulation of events which both precede the *Iliad* and which are contained in the *Iliad*, from Achilles' sacking of eleven cities, his defeats of Telephus, Eetion, Kyknos,

41 Cf. Maciver (2012a) 109; Vian (1963) xvii calls him “le porte-parole de la pensée stoïcisante du poète.” On Nestor in the *Iliad*, among many other studies, see Haubold (2000) 62–64, 69–75.

42 On the gnomic statements spoken by the primary narrator, and for the following statistics, see Maciver (2012a) 92–93 and 90–92: of the 132 *gnomai* in the *Posthomeric* (a proportionally much higher total than in the *Iliad*, which has 150 *gnomai*), thirty-three are spoken by the primary narrator (only three are in the Iliadic primary narrator's words). As a result, the main narrative of Quintus' poem is unavoidably ethical / proverbial in tone. Nestor has the highest total of *gnomai* of all of the poem's characters: nineteen.

43 Further discussion in Maciver (2012a) 103–106.

44 More specific discussion in Maciver (2012a) 111–119.

45 For Nestor as embodiment of Quintus the *poeta doctus*, I follow here the brief but cogent discussion of Schmitz (2007) 79–80.

Polydorus, Troilus, and Asteropaios; and also his killing of Hector, Penthesileia, and Memnon (4.150–610). Nestor includes events recounted in the *Cypria*, the *Iliad*, and the *Posthomerica* itself.⁴⁶ As this knower of ancient stories, he is the speaker-symbol of Quintus the poet, recounting the tales which audiences and readers had received from three different poets (including Quintus). Thus Quintus positions himself as the heir to the post-Iliadic Trojan tales, in place of the *Aethiopis*' account of the deaths of Penthesileia and Memnon. Nestor's captive audience are described as hearing things from him that they already knew (4.162–163): καὶ τὰ μὲν Ἀργείοισιν ἐπισταμένοισι καὶ αὐτοῖς / μέλπε (“and he performed things to the Argives which they already themselves knew”), and this has been taken by some as referring to the tales of Thetis and Achilles narrated up to that point in Nestor's account, and by extension to the learned readers of Quintus who are already acquainted with the events which Quintus (here through Nestor) narrates.⁴⁷ The actual syntax points here, however, to a different scenario, if this meta-poetic reading of Nestor's audience as symbolic of Quintus' readers stands. The μὲν of line 162 is answered by the δέ of line 169: εὐχέτο δ' ἄθανάτοισι καὶ υἱέα τοῖον ἰδέσθαι (“he prayed to the gods to see a son just like this”). Thus Nestor describes, on the one hand, the stature and appearance of Achilles (162–168); and on the other, prays that his son might be of such an ilk, when he comes to Troy (169–170). The emphatic καί of 162 at the beginning conjoins the information about Achilles' previous exploits with things which the Argives already knew, namely, his appearance, since they themselves saw him, but did not see all of his pre-Troy exploits. The multiple uses of καί ... τε (163–168) expands upon τὰ μὲν (162), as those very things known are listed. I must, therefore, dispute some of the apparently meta-poetic characteristics of this passage: what the Argives, did *not* know were the pre-Homeric events of Achilles life, before they saw him. We cannot state, subsequently, that Quintus' readers by extension were not fully aware of Achilles' pre-Homeric life. That is: according to this interpretation, Quintus' readers did not have access to the Epic Cycle, or at least, were unaware of these exploits. This is untenable, and

46 For the order of events and their inclusion within those epics, see Vian (1963) 142 nn. 1–4. Another recounting of the events surrounding the Trojan War, which essentially caps off the action of the *Posthomerica*, is found at 14.125–132, this time in the words of a *tis* speaker.

47 Specifically Schmitz (2007) 83, on 4.162–163: “This attitude of the audience is a clear mirror image of the relationship between Quintus' narrator and his audience ... it is clear, then, that Quintus uses such intertextual anachronies to provide a meta-poetical commentary on his role as a belated epic poet who has to shape a well-known tradition for a learned audience.”

while Nestor surely stands as the symbolic extension of Quintus the poet within the text, the meta-poetics, in this passage at least, *contra* Schmitz (2007), stop there.

Nestor sings in hexameters, in a contest, in front of a willing audience who award him a prize at the end. Before all athletic events, epic composition is given first place. There is a broad model for this pattern. Already in the *Odyssey*, two of Demodocus' songs act as a prelude to the games of the Phaeacians (8.104–235) in which Odysseus himself takes part.⁴⁸ The tradition of competition in song is itself ancient,⁴⁹ dating back to archaic poetic competitions at the games.⁵⁰ Hesiod himself speaks of gaining a prize for his song (*hymnos*) at a competition in Chalcis (*Op.* 654–657),⁵¹ at the funeral games of Amphidamas.⁵² So poetic competition within a funereal context has a tradition.⁵³ Performances in hexameter recall too the rhapsodic competitions discussed particularly in Plato's *Ion*.

Emphasis on competition in words (124: εἰν ἀγορῇ ἐπέων πέρι δῆρις),⁵⁴ and pre-eminence in the *agora* (Nestor is described as pre-eminent in that respect, above both Odysseus and Agamemnon—4.123–127) could indicate too the

48 Vian (1963) 140 n. 4 also points to the potential for a singing contest in the *Iliad*, at 23.886, if the variant ῥήμονες be read for the (surely correct) ἥμονες—cf. Plutarch *Quaest. Conv.* 675a. Thus, Quintus, in typically Alexandrian fashion, could be signalling his reading of the variants at that place in the *Iliad*.

49 One thinks first and foremost of the performance of Pindar's *Odes*, on which, see Carey (2007) 199–210.

50 Plutarch discusses this at *Quaest. Conv.* 674d–675d, with reference to the Pythian games and the famed contest between Homer and Hesiod.

51 Plutarch *Quaest. Conv.* 675a athetizes these lines—for which, see West (1978) ad loc. There is insufficient evidence to doubt their genuineness.

52 *Hymnos* there is used in the more ancient general sense for narrative or didactic poetry (see West (1978) 321).

53 Cf. West (1978) 320–321 for discussion and references. The terminology used for the manner in which Nestor performs his praise of Thetis and Achilles is important: he begins by hymning Thetis (ὑμνεῖν, 129), and proceeds to celebrate with song and dance, perhaps to musical accompaniment, as the verb μέλω seems to suggest (147, 163), but his verses are most certainly hexameter, even though his song is reported in indirect speech (ἔπεισεν, 171, makes this clear). It is most likely that Quintus is applying the more traditional significances to these verbs: *hymnos*, as discussed for Hesiod, need imply only ἀοιδή (song), especially given the emphasis on hexameter. For the praise aspect of μέλω, cf. *Il.* 1.474 (with LSJ s.v. II. 2) with the entry in *LexFrGrEp.* for further references.

54 Quintus uses δῆρις twenty-five times, in varied contexts, from martial fighting to quarrels. An interesting use in Homer occurs at *Od.* 8.76, in Demodocus' song about Achilles and Odysseus quarrelling in words at the feast of the gods.

types of epideictic performance found in the peak of sophistic oratory of the early Roman Imperial period, or the so-called Second Sophistic. The categorization, as characterizing prose writing and performance, is not a suitable label for the *Posthomerica*, despite some attempts in that direction in recent scholarship,⁵⁵ but there are certainly elements throughout the poem which emphasize rhetoric. The *Hoplōn Krisis* in book 5, in particular, contains traits which, in some respects, resemble the rhetorical exercises typical of the early Imperial period.⁵⁶ More recently, scholars have argued that parts, or all, of Quintus' poem were designed primarily to be performed.⁵⁷ What the scene does represent is virtuoso composition on a chosen mythological theme, for a given audience. Nestor stands in the middle (118 and 128: ἐν(ι) μέσσοισιν; 147: μέλπε μέσῳ ἐν ἄγωνι, πολὺς δ' ἀμφίαχε λαός), a position reserved for speaking and judgment, but emphasized here as the middle of the *agon*.⁵⁸ Nestor is competing (albeit against no opponent, but for a prize, as part of the games). Similarly, a sophist would rise to speak extemporaneously on a theme chosen on the spot, and if well-delivered, would receive the acclaim of a similarly well-educated audience: all was in essence a display of learning, and the speeches themselves constructs of a very rigid and traditional educational syllabus.⁵⁹ While Nestor's *encomium* belongs to an early tradition of funerary song, the Imperial setting of Quintus' poem, and especially its early readership, elicits a more contemporary interpretation too.⁶⁰

Quintus rarely emphasizes geographical phenomena other than those found in the Homeric poems too. In the case of Niobe, he alludes to Achilles' mytho-

55 Esp. Baumbach and Bär (2007) 8–15, and Bär (2010). See my opposing arguments in Maciver (2012a) 17–18 and esp. Maciver (2012c) 602–607.

56 Discussion in Maciver (2012c) 604–606. Eustathius commented that Quintus' representation of the contest was rhetorical (1698.48).

57 Cantilena (2001). At a recent conference, too, on Imperial Greek Epic (Cambridge, 2013), the idea of Quintus' performance was frequently raised as a realistic possibility.

58 For Martin (1989) 95, all speeches in Homer are agonistic, but Nestor here in Quintus is competing for a prize.

59 Discussion *passim* in Whitmarsh (2005), and see too Anderson (1993) 55–64 on epideictic *meletai*.

60 I do not wish to argue this point too strongly: we do not have enough evidence to suggest that Quintus' epic, in part or whole, was performed. What is evident is the influence of rhetorical *progymnasmata* in certain areas of the poem, especially ecphrasis, *encomia* (like this one), and *chreiai* (in Quintus, in the form of mythological *paradeigmata*)—the most recent (excellent) work on this is Miguelez-Cavero (2008). The problems in recent scholarship on this theme (esp. Miguelez-Cavero (2008)) is that the poetic tradition has too often been ignored, as a result. Cf. my review of that book—Maciver (2013).

logical *exemplum* in *Iliad* 24 in a most unusual manner, one which, again, points to the chronological distance between the two epics.

Δρησαῖον δ' ἐδάμασσαν ἀρηίφιλος Πολυποίτης
 τὸν τέκε δῖα Νέαιρα περίφρονι Θειοδάμαντι
 μιχθεῖς ἐν λεχέεσσιν ὑπαὶ Σιπύλῳ νιφόνετι,
 ἥχι θεοὶ Νιόβην λᾶαν θέσαν, ἥς ἔτι δάκρυ
 295 πουλὺ μάλα στυφελῆς καταλείβεται ὑψόθε πέτρης,
 καὶ οἱ συστοναχοῦσι ῥοαὶ πολυηχέος Ἑρμοῦ
 καὶ κορυφαὶ Σιπύλου περιμήκεες ὧν καθύπερθεν
 ἐχθρὴ μηλονόμοισιν αἰεὶ περιπέπτατ' ὀμίχλη·
 ἥ δὲ πέλει μέγα θαῦμα παρессυμένοισι βροτοῖσιν,
 300 οὐνεκ' ἔοικε γυναικὶ πολυστόνῳ ἢ τ' ἐπὶ λυγρῷ
 πένθει μυρομένη μάλα μυρία δάκρυα χεύει·
 καὶ τὸ μὲν ἀτρεκέως φῆς ἔμμεναι, ὅππότ' ἄρ' αὐτὴν
 τηλόθεν ἀθρήσειας· ἐπὴν δέ οἱ ἐγγὺς ἴκηαι,
 φαίνεται αἰπήσσσα πέτρη Σιπύλοιό τ' ἀπορρώξ.

And warlike Polypoetes struck down Dresaeus whom brilliant Neaera bore to wise Theiodamas when she had mingled with him in bed under snowy Sipylus, where the gods turned Niobe into stone, whose great tear still flows out from the hard rock above, and the streams of resounding Hermes groan out in response and the broad peaks of Sipylus, down from above which a mist, hateful to shepherds, always flies about. And she is a great marvel to all mortals who pass that way, because like a woman in great grief she pours forth countless tears, mourning as she does in her bitter sorrow. And you would say that it truly was the case, were you at some point to view her from afar. But when you come close, the sheer rock of Sipylus, broken off, appears.

Posthomerica 1.291–304

This is a vignette, an elaboration on the death of a minor hero, whose home or origin is given added emphasis in the narrative, for the sake of pathos—a typical Homeric battle-scene device.⁶¹ In this case, there is an unusual elaboration of detail for Mount Sipylus, where Neaera had conceived the warrior Dresaeus, the Lydian hero here stuck down by Polypoetes. Quintus uses the extension to provide further discourse on the original Niobe mythological paradigm spoken

61 Most thorough discussion is still Beye (1964).

by Achilles to Priam at *Iliad* 24.602–620—the point of the tale being that, as Niobe could eat despite her extreme grief, so should Priam. Achilles alludes to the possibility (24.614–617) that Niobe, as a rock in Sipylus, still weeps. He distances himself from the definiteness of this point through his use of *που* and *ᾧ* *φασι* (614 and 615): *νῦν δὲ που ἐν πέτρῃσιν, ἐν οὐρεσιν οἰοπόλοισιν / ἐν Σιπύλῳ, ᾧ φασὶ θεάων ἔμμεναι εὐνάς / νυμφάων, αἳ τ' ἀμφ' Ἀχελώιον ἐρρώσαντο, / ἔνθα λίθος περ ἐοῦσα θεῶν ἐκ κήδεα πέσσει* (614–617).⁶² Quintus concretizes what is only alluded to by Achilles.⁶³ The reader can now visit this very rock and see for him/herself that it actually is there, and if one looks far away enough from the site, it does indeed look like Niobe weeping.⁶⁴ What Achilles initially localized, Quintus verifies: what is potentially only fictional for the sake of the story, is actualized by Quintus, and is verifiable by the reader. Thus, Quintus vouches for the veracity of the Homeric tale, and counters the doubt cast on these verses by the Alexandrian scholia.⁶⁵ Quintus therefore marks out his belatedness as a later visitor of Homeric “landmarks”. The meta-poetic bearing of *ἔτι δάκρυ* (294) is also clear.⁶⁶ Niobe was crying when Achilles spoke his paradigm, and is still crying when we receive this vignette in the *Posthomeric*. Ad-hoc poetic production, like Niobe's tears, but especially like Achilles' Homeric *narration* of those tears, flows easily on within Quintus' poem. He is part of this continuum of production, despite chronological distance. Moreover, because of this chronological distance, Quintus and his readers react to and re-mould Homer's poeticisms and narrative. Like Niobe who is now rock, and a great wonder to

62 “And now, I guess, among the rocks, among the deserted mountains in Sipylus, where they say the beds of the divine nymphs are, who danced around Achelous, there—though stone—she broods on the sorrows she has received from the gods.”

63 In this way, he mirrors the scholion AD on *Il.* 24.602, where it is stated that one can still see this rock.

64 Quintus seems to follow very closely here the account in Pausanias 1.21.3. Pausanias, like Quintus, writes of the two perspectives—from close-up, and from afar. Vian (1959) 131 wishes to see in the poem's careful description of the location evidence that Quintus was actually from Smyrna (which is in the vicinity of Sipylus), but there is nothing in Quintus' account which he could not have gained from Pausanias.

65 For which see Richardson (1993) 341–343. The bT scholia, on *Il.* 24.614–617, insisted that the lines should be athetized since Achelous was in Lydia, not near Sipylus. For solutions to this and other apparent problems, see Richardson loc. cit.

66 Nonnus (28.428–429) makes similar use of Niobe's still-flowing tears, drawing perhaps on Quintus himself: *εἰσέτι δάκρυα λείβει / ὄμμασι πετραίοισιν* (“she still pours out tears with her rocky eyes”). Nonnus makes extensive use of Niobe: 2.159–160, 12.79–81, 130–132, 48.406–408, 417, 424–432, 455–456. Cf. too Ovid *Met.* 6.301–312.

those who behold her (299: ἡ δὲ πέλει μέγα θαῦμα παρессυμένοισι βροτοῖσιν),⁶⁷ Homer's epics are stable literary landmarks which produce reader-responses. In Quintus' production of the *Posthomeric* he can, on multiple occasions, signify his relationship to the Homeric epics, by reading, recreating, and expounding them.

Noticeable within the passage, too, is Quintus' inclusion of a famous Iliadic simile: the mist which is hateful to shepherds (298) recalls *Iliad* 3.11, where the dust cloud raised by the advancing troops is similarly compared. Quintus alters, however, his word for shepherd: where the *Iliad* has ποιμέσιν οὐ τι φίλην, Quintus has ἐχθρὴ μηλονόμοισιν, a noun which does not occur in early epic, but which recurs in late epic, especially in Nonnus.⁶⁸ Quintus has appropriated this Homeric simile and has inserted it within a passage which contains so much evidence of *lateness* of composition, and has exchanged for shepherd a late-epic word for an early-epic one. Despite Quintus' seamless transition from the *Iliad*, and his own carefully constructed Homeric *persona* for his narrator, he leaves signs of lateness for readers to spot, who, like him, have read their Homer with minute care.

Conclusion

To write Homeric epic almost a millennium after Homer will inevitably bring with it signs of lateness. Quintus constructs an epic to remove such differences, to be *still* Homer, only to posit footnotes which point to the manner in which he wishes his epic to be read vis-à-vis the Homeric poems. Lateness is a position of advantage: as a reader of Homer, Quintus can insert within his macro-narrative readings of those epics which have been imitated and puzzled over by every other post-Homeric poet and scholar. He can also, more immediately in terms of reception, continue the tales of Troy through a medium in which parts of those tales were already cast. This epic continuation is one which both emphasizes connection with the epic archetype, but which advertises what post-Alexandrian epic, with its array of Homeric readings, can create

67 It is interesting to note the ecphrastic language in this description: θαῦμα (299), e.g., and ἐπὶ δὲ οἱ ἐγγὺς ἵκηται (303), where the reaction of the reader is elicited. Unlike similar signals in the shield of Achilles, the reader may personally attest to these feelings by viewing the actual object outside of the world of the poem.

68 It occurs twice in Euripides (*Alc.* 573, *Cyc.* 660), nine times in Nonnus, and five times in Quintus.

as both homage and rival to the richness discovered continually within the inescapable, ever-present Homeric poems. In Quintus, we are still reading Homer, and will continue to do so.

Bibliography

- Anderson, G. (1993) *The Second Sophistic. A Cultural Phenomenon in the Roman Empire*. London, New York.
- Bär, S. (2007) "Quintus Smyrnaeus und die Tradition des epischen Musenanrufs," in Baumbach and Bär (2007) 29–64.
- Bär, S. (2009) *Quintus Smyrnaeus, Posthomerica 1: die Wiedergeburt des Epos aus dem Geiste der Amazonomachie. Mit einem Kommentar zu den Versen 1–219*. Göttingen.
- Bär, S. (2010) "Quintus of Smyrna and the Second Sophistic," *HSPH* 105: 287–316.
- Baumbach, M. (2007) "Die Poetik der Schilde: Form und Funktion von Ekphraseis in den *Posthomerica* des Quintus Smyrnaeus," in Baumbach and Bär (2007) 107–142.
- Baumbach, M., and Bär, S. (eds) (2007) *Quintus Smyrnaeus: Transforming Homer in Second Sophistic Epic*. Berlin.
- Baumbach, M. and Bär, S. (2007) "An Introduction to Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*," in Baumbach and Bär (2007) 1–26.
- Baumbach, M. and Bär, S. (eds) (2012) *Brill's Companion to the Greek and Roman Epyllion and its Reception*. Leiden.
- Beye, C.R. (1964) "Homeric Battle Narrative and Catalogues," *HSPH* 68: 345–373.
- Byre, C.S. (1982) "*Per Aspera (et Arborem) ad Astra*: Ramifications of the Allegory of *Arete* in Quintus Smyrnaeus *Posthomerica* 5.49–68," *Hermes* 110: 184–195.
- Cantilena, M. (2001) "Chronologia e tecnica compositiva dei *Posthomerica* di Quinto Smirneo," in Montanari and Pittaluga (2001) 51–70.
- Carey, C. (2007) "Pindar, place and performance," in Hornblower and Morgan (2007) 199–210.
- Gärtner, U. (2005) *Quintus Smyrnaeus und die Aeneis: Zur Nachwirkung Vergils in der griechischen Literatur der Kaiserzeit*. Munich.
- Graziosi, B. (2002) *Inventing Homer: The Early Reception of Epic*. Cambridge.
- Hainsworth, J.B. (1991) *The Idea of Epic*. Berkeley.
- Haubold, J. (2000) *Homer's People. Epic Poetry and Social Formation*. Cambridge.
- Hopkinson, N. (ed.) (1994) *Greek Poetry of the Imperial Period: An Anthology*. Cambridge.
- Hornblower, S. and Morgan, C. (eds) (2007) *Pindar's Poetry, Patrons, and Festivals*. Oxford.
- James, A. (2004) *The Trojan Epic: "Posthomerica," Quintus of Smyrna*. Baltimore.
- Kennedy, G.A. (1994) *A New History of Classical Rhetoric*. Princeton.

- Keydell, R. (1965) "Review of Vian (1963)," *Gnomon* 37: 36–44.
- Lefteratou, A., Stamatopoulos, K., Tanaseanu-Döbler, I. (eds) (2016) *Reading the way to the Netherworld. Education and representations of the beyond in Later Antiquity*. Göttingen.
- Maciver, C.A. (2007) "Returning to the Mountain of Arete: Reading Ecphrasis, Constructing Ethics," in Baumbach and Bär (2007) 259–284.
- Maciver, C.A. (2012a) *Quintus Smyrnaeus' Posthomerica: Engaging Homer in Late Antiquity*. Leiden, Boston.
- Maciver, C.A. (2012b) "Representative Bees in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*," *CPh* 107.1: 53–69.
- Maciver, C.A. (2012c) "Flyte of Odysseus: Allusion and the *Hoplōn Krisis* in Quintus Smyrnaeus, *Posthomerica* 5," *American Journal of Philology* 133.4: 601–628.
- Maciver, C.A. (2013) "Review of Miguélez Caveró (2008)," *Classical Review* 63.2: 404–406.
- Maciver, C.A. (2016) "A Homeric afterlife in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*?", in Lefteratou, Stamatopoulos, and Tanaseanu-Döbler (2016) 123–137.
- Martin, R.P. (1989) *The Language of Heroes: Speech and Performance in the Iliad*, Ithaca.
- Miguélez Caveró, L. (2008) *Poems in Context: Greek Poetry in the Egyptian Thebaid 200–600 AD*. Berlin.
- Montanari, F. and Pittaluga, S. (eds) (2001) *Posthomerica. Tradizioni omeriche dall'Antichità al Rinascimento*. vol. 3. Genova.
- Porter, S.E. (ed.) (1997) *Handbook of Classical Rhetoric in the Hellenistic Period, 330 B.C. – A.D. 400*. Leiden.
- Richardson, N.J. (1993) *The Iliad: A Commentary*. Volume VI: *Books 21–24*. Cambridge.
- Roberts, W.R. (ed.) (1902) *Demetrius on Style*. Cambridge.
- Rowe, G.O. (1997) "Style," in Porter (2007) 121–158.
- Schenk, P. (1997) "Handlungsstruktur und Komposition in den *Posthomerica* des Quintus Smyrnaeus," *RhM* 140: 363–385.
- Schmitz, T. (2007) "The Use of Analepses and Prolepses in Quintus Smyrnaeus' *Posthomerica*," in Baumbach and Bär (2007) 65–84.
- Schubert, P. (2007) "From the Epics to the Second Sophistic, from Hecuba to Aethra, and finally from Troy to Athens: Defining the Position of Quintus Smyrnaeus in his *Posthomerica*," in Baumbach and Bär (2007) 339–355.
- Thomas, R.F. (1985) "From *Recusatio* to Commitment: The Evolution of the Vergilian Program," *PLLS* 5: 61–73.
- Tomasso, V. (2012) "The Fast and the Furious: The Reception of Homer in Triphiodorus' *Capture of Troy*," in Baumbach and Bär (2012) 371–409.
- Vian (1959) *Recherches sur les Posthomerica de Quintus de Smyrne*. Paris.
- Vian, F. (ed.) (1963) *Quintus de Smyrne, La suite d'Homère*, Tome 1. Paris.

- Vian, F. (ed.) (1966) *Quintus de Smyrne, La suite d'Homère*, Tome 2. Paris.
- Vian, F. (ed.) (1969) *Quintus de Smyrne, La suite d'Homère*, Tome 3. Paris.
- West, M.L. (ed.) (1978) *Hesiod: Works and Days*. Oxford.
- Whitmarsh, T. (2005) *The Second Sophistic*. Oxford.

Teaching Homer through (Annotated) Poetry: John Tzetzes' *Carmina Iliaca*

Marta Cardin

ση(μείωσαι) πόσῃν ἀγάπῃ(ν) εἶχ(εν) ὁ Τζέτζης εἰς τ(ὸν) θαυμάσιον Ὅμηρον¹



1 Homer and Tzetzes: A Prelude

“The twelfth century was ... a Homeric century;” “Homer was idolized and one could have a mental life immersed in the classics.” In *Hellenism in Byzantium*, Anthony Kaldellis vividly describes the Komnenian era (ca. 1081–1185) as a period when Homeric poetry was especially loved: Homer was read, summarized, commented on, allegorized, quoted in various works and occasions, taught at school, regarded as the father of rhetoric, echoed in order to celebrate Komnenian aristocracy. The legacy of ancient Greece was so appreciated and treasured that Classicism could become a profession and “Hellenism ... at least a vocation”, as it did for the *grammatikos* John Tzetzes (born ca. 1110, died after 1166), one of the most prolific authors of the twelfth century.²

1 “Note how much love Tzetzes had for the marvelous Homer,” cod. Ambr. c 222 inf. (end of the XII cent.), f. 234v marg.: see Mazzucchi (2004) 420.

2 See Kaldellis (2007) 234–247, 301–307 (quotations from pp. 243, 307) and (2009). I am deeply indebted to his investigation on the reception of classics and the classical scholarship of the twelfth century. On Homer in the Komnenian era see Basilikopoulou-Ioannidou (1971); Browning (1975), esp. 25–29, and (1992); Morgan (1983), who calls Tzetzes “the leading interpreter of Homer”; Magdalino (1993) 400–403 and 431 (on Theodore Prodromos’ encomiastic poetry in hexameters); Lavagnini (1997) 51–55; Cupane (2008) 253–255; Cullhed (2014a) on Eustathios (often compared with Tzetzes); Goldwyn—Kokkini (2015), xvi–xx. On scholarly achievements Pontani (2005a) 159–178 and (2015) 366–394. The traditional chronology of Tzetzes’ life (ca. 1110–1180/85) has been established by Wendel (1948) in the only modern study we have that investigates both the life and works of the Byzantine scholar (see coll. 1960–1965). Recently, Grünbart (2005) 424–425 has drawn attention to the fact that we have no certain evidence of him living after 1170 (the last chronological datum from his *Letters* is in the middle of the sixties and he was ill), since the authorship of two epitaphs for Manuel I

He had “a mental life immersed in the classics.” He devoured books of ancient Greek literature, from the refined verses of Lycophron to the technical prose of mathematicians, by having access also to very old manuscripts preserved in the libraries of Constantinople (primarily the Imperial library).³ Books were the spring of his learning: since he was not a god, he needed them to be accurate in his writings (Tzetz. *Historiae* 12.2, 4); when he had no volumes at hand, his mind was his *bibliothēke* (*Allegoriae Iliadis* 15.87–89), and even if his exceptional memory could fail, it enabled him to write rapidly a considerable amount of erudite information, as anyone could verify by running to observe him at work (*Hist.* 8.173–180).⁴ His livelihood was dependent upon that learning: he called himself a νοογάρτωρ, “living by his intellectual capacity” (*Epistula*

(†1180) and for another emperor, maybe Andronikos I (†1185), is uncertain (the poems are edited in *Anecdota Graeca* pp. 619–622 Matranga and Arco Magrì [1961], respectively; see also Wendel cit. 2000–2001). A poem celebrating the refortification of Dorylaion in 1175, transmitted with Tzetzean works (and with the epitaph for the anonymous emperor), is probably not by Tzetzes: see Spingou (2011). According to Agiotis (2013), traces of Tzetzes after 1170 might be found in the epigram on Psellos’ commentary on Aristotle’s *De interpretatione*, where Tzetzes might have borrowed the comparison between exegesis and pearl discovery from a writing of Eustathios dated to 1174–1178; but see now Cullhed (2015). Byzantine authors of scholars’ writings, esp. Tzetzes, have recently been considered in their own right: see Budelmann (2002); Kaldellis (2007) 301, (2009) 32; Cullhed (2014b). Braccini (2009–2010), (2010), (2011) has investigated the *Carmina Iliaca* according to this view. Leone wrote the first overall investigation of the poem (1984a), as well as studies on its manuscript tradition (1984b, 1985a, 1986, 1989) and ancient quotations and sources (1984c, 1985b, 1985c, 1991a), which led to the only modern critical edition of the *Carmina Iliaca* (1995). I shall quote other works by Tzetzes from the following editions: *Allegoriae Iliadis* according to Matranga (1850) and Boissonade (1851) (I shall indicate different numbering of the lines; Boissonade’s text is translated with introduction and short notes by Goldwyn—Kokkini [2015]); *Allegoriae Odysseae* Hunger (1955a, 1956); *Exegesis in Aristophanis Ranas* Koster (1962); *Exegesis in Hesiodi Opera et Dies* Cardin, in preparation (I shall give also lines numbering of Gaisford [1823²]); *Exegesis in Homeri Iliadem* Papathomopoulos (2007); *Exegesis in Lycophronis Alexandram* Scheer (1908); *Exegesis in Oppiani Halieutica* Bussemaker (1849); *Epistulae* Leone (1972); *Historiae* Leone (2007²).

- 3 Tzetzes’ predilection for ancient manuscripts and his custom of adding marginal notes on them have been analysed by Luzzatto (1998), (1999), (2000). See e.g. Tzetz. *Historiae* 6.399–401, with the textual correction of v. 401 by Luzzatto (1999) 157–158 n. 3. Tzetzes could read some works now lost, like some poems of Hipponax: see Scheer (1908) 13–16; Wendel (1948) 2007–2009; Wilson (1996²) 196 and on Hipponax Masson (1962) 42–52; Degani (1984) 80–81.
- 4 In these passages, Tzetzes justifies some inaccuracies (about the name of Galen’s father, a line of Empedocles cited by heart, and a Homeric hexameter) by stressing that he had no books, because of poverty (*Alleg. Il.*) or the extemporariness in writing (*Hist.*). See also *Hist.* 6.469–470, 9.744–754, 10.355–361, where Tzetzes quotes the Homeric line ἀργαλέον δέ με ταῦτα θεῶν ὧς πάντ’ ἀγορεύσαι (“it is hard for me to tell everything like a god”, Hom. *Iliad* 12.176), showing how

75, p. 109.18 L.), from Aristophanean ἐγγλωττογάστωρ (“living by his eloquence”, said of sophists in *Aves* 1695).⁵ As he explained in the *historia* related to this passage (the *Histories* are a very long collection of poems intended to explain classical or puzzling allusions in Tzetzes’ own *Letters*), a *noogastor* is “a man who composes with thought his writings, exegeses, verse, and poems, and draws his nourishment from them” (*Hist.* 10.768–769).⁶ Here, Tzetzes lists the kind of works he writes as a teacher and under patronage, mainly commentaries on the most important ancient Greek authors (e.g. on Hesiod and Aristophanes), and didactic poems initiating noblemen to ancient Greek culture and literature (like the *Theogony*, a compendium of Greek mythology in decapentasyllables for the Sebastokratorissa Irene).⁷ Among these works, his beloved Homer, “the all-wise, the sea of tales” (ὁ πάνσοφος, ἡ θάλασσα τῶν λόγων, *Alleg. Il. prooem.* 51 = *Hist.* 13.620), had a considerable prominence.

Tzetzes wrote an extended line by line exegesis on the first book of the *Iliad* with a long preface, which outlined previous scholarly engagements with Homeric poems (beginning with Aristarchus and ending with Psellos), the poet’s life and works, the causes of the Trojan War, title, content and form of the *Iliad*. It was like a modern edition, intended for a learned audience of students and scholars.⁸ He also composed the aforementioned *Allegories on the Iliad* and

Homeric poetry could be used to emphasize and embellish his own writing (cf. also *Exeg. Il.* p. 6.17–18 P., where Tzetzes quotes Hom. *Il.* 12.176 with the addition of 22.415). The “god” is not the Christian one: Ἑρμῆς γὰρ ὁ χρυσόρραπις οὐ μάχεται τῇ λήθῃ (“Hermes with wand of gold does not contend with forgetfulness”, 9.750, also in *De metris* p. 332.31 Cramer). These cases illustrate how classicists of the twelfth century could refer to pagan deities within the frame of rhetoric: see Kaldellis (2007) 245. On Tzetzes’ pride about his ability to remember what he read see e.g. *Hist.* 1.278–281; on Homeric quotations in the twelfth century see Nünlist (2012) and Cullhed (2014a), 39*–46*.

5 ἄνθρωπος ἐγγλωττογάστωρ, ἢ μᾶλλον προσφυστέρως εἰπεῖν νοογάστωρ ἐγώ, καὶ τεχνύθριον καὶ χειρωναξία οἱ λόγοι μου καθεστήκατον καὶ συγγράμματα, οἷσπερ καρποῦμαι τὰ πρὸς ζωὴν, οἷσπερ καὶ μόνοις ἐγὼ διατρέφομαι κτλ., “I am a man *englottogastor*, or—to say it more suitably—*noogastor*: my discourses and my writings are my little art and my handicraft; from them I earn my livelihood, only from them I am nourished” (*Epistula* 75, pp. 109.16–110.1 L.; dated to ca. 1150: see Grünbart [1996] 210–211). On Tzetzes’ life as a layman compelled to earn his living by teaching and writing see Grünbart (2005).

6 δς λογισμῷ συγγράμματα συντάττων, ἐξηγήσεις / καὶ στίχους καὶ ποιήματα τρέφει αὐτὸν ἐκ τούτων (*Hist.* 10.768–769).

7 On learned commentaries see Kaldellis (2009); on Tzetzes’ works on commission see Rhoby (2010).

8 On the “useful scholarly ‘editions’” emerging in the twelfth century see Kaldellis (2009) 31–32: they “anticipate ours in having a scholarly introduction ... followed by the text with massive

on the *Odyssey*, where he summarized and explained the two poems in easy political verse for his patrons (at first the empress Irene-Bertha of Sulzbach, wife of Manuel I; then the noble Constantine Kotertzes), providing them with Ariadne's thread—i.e. the allegorical interpretation of the main passages—to trace their way out of the labyrinth of Homeric poetry and myths (*Allegoriae Odysseae* 24.288–290).⁹ But Tzetzes' earliest work concerning Homer was quite different from both of these. The so-called *Carmina Iliaca* is a hexameter account of the Trojan War with explanatory notes: a short epic poem (1676 lines)—addressed by Tzetzes to his students—which recounts the background of the *Iliad*, what Homer said about the fight, and the events that led to the capture of Troy, all with Tzetzes' own annotations clarifying the poetic text.

2 The *Carmina Iliaca*: When and Why

Tzetzes wrote his *Carmina Iliaca* between the ages of 21 and 28. In the poem, he often mentions his unsuccessful adventure as private secretary of an Isaac, eparch of Berroia, in Macedonia: slandered by Isaac's wife, Tzetzes was disgraced and forced to return to Constantinople and sell his books—which he could still use at 21—for money.¹⁰ On the other hand, in the preface of the *Exegesis on the Iliad*, written seven or eight years after these events, he refers to his earlier verse composition (τὸ ἡμέτερον ἔμμετρον ποίημα) inviting his audience to read it for a detailed (κατὰ λεπτομέρειαν) account of the war until the fall of Troy (*Exeg.II. proll.* p. 67.6–10 P.).¹¹

scholia compiled by a 'modern' scholar such as Tzetzes who had a distinctive personal voice." On Homer as Ocean see Pontani (2000) 34 *ad Eust. proll. in Od.* 96 Pontani, and the passages collected by Williams (1978) 98–99.

9 On the epilogue of the *Allegoriae Odysseae* (24.276–293) see Hunger (1955a) 48; Cesaretti (1991) 198–199. Tzetzes offered a large *accessus* to the Homeric poems also in his *Homeric Allegories*: an account of Homer's life, of the events that precede Achilles' wrath, and portraits of Achaean and Trojan heroes (*Alleg.II. prooem.* 41–1207 M. = 41–1204 B.); this proem "comprises nearly one sixth of the work" on the *Iliad* (Goldwyn—Kokkini [2015], vii).

10 In *schol. Exeg.II. proll.* p. 5.2, p. 421.15–18 P., Tzetzes says that when he was 21 years old he still had books to read, but afterwards he could not use them anymore, because of poverty due to a woman (*scil.* Isaac's wife). Therefore, he was ca. 21 years old when he left Berroia. For the doubtful identification of the Isaac of Berroia see Kaldellis (2009) 26–27 and n. 62 (with earlier bibliography). Tzetzes alludes to this story in *Carm. Il.* 2.137–159; 3.284–290, 620–625, 702, 753–756; *schol.* 3.284 L. His insistence suggests that it is a recent humiliation, as Giske (1881) 53 already noticed.

11 In *Exeg.II. proll.* p. 22.4–11 P., Tzetzes remarks that it has been seven, nearly eight years

This reference reveals the nature of the *Carmina Iliaca*: a *poiema* that serves as an introduction to the *Iliad* for Homer's readers. The title of the poem conveys the same content: Ἰωάννου γραμματικοῦ τοῦ Τζέτζου τὰ πρὸ Ὀμήρου καὶ ὅσα παρέχει Ὀμηρος μέχρι καὶ τῆς ἀλώσεως ἥτοι ἡ μικρομεγάλη Ἰλιάς ("Events that precede Homer and what Homer recounts extending down to the capture of Troy, i.e. the *Little Great Iliad*, by the *grammatikos* John Tzetzes").¹² Tzetzes wrote an *Iliad* that expanded on the Homeric poem (*Great*), yet small in size (*Little*).¹³ Some manuscripts have headings or marginal notes that separate the hexameters into three sections: the *antehomerica* (406 vv.), *homerica* (490 vv.), and *posthomerica* (780 vv.), a distinction maintained by editors until Leone. Leone stressed that "we can rightly suppose that it [*scil.* the *Carmina Iliaca*] was conceived and written as a *carmen continuum*, i.e. without a break."—but he retained the traditional tripartition as well as the title, both allowed by custom.¹⁴ The mention of the work as a single *poiema* in the *Exegesis on the Iliad*

since he has been forced to sell his books. Hence, he wrote the *exegesis* seven/eight years after he was 21. On this chronological frame see Giske (1881) 52–53; Hart (1881) 14; Wendel (1948) 1961–1962. The allusion to a metrical work in *schol. Carm. Il.* 2.312, p. 201.7 L. (ἐν τοῖς μετρικοῖς ἡμῶν συγγράμμασιν) might refer to Tzetzes' *De metris*, p. 315.6–11 Cramer, which was composed after the death of Tzetzes' brother, i.e. after 1138 (see Shepard [1979] 203 n. 6). If we consider the *scholia* to be written mainly just after the poetic text—as I am inclined to think (see below §5)—this might be evidence for dating the *Carmina Iliaca* between around 1138 and the Homeric *exegesis*.

- 12 Only one manuscript—Vindob. phil. gr. 308 (xvi cent.)—seems to preserve the original title, as shown by Leone (1984a) 383–385. μικρομεγάλη, "little great", was read by Tychsen (1788) 7 from μικρὰ-μεγάλη (with *o supra lineam*) of the codex; Hart (1881) 34 suggested μικρὰ καὶ μεγάλη. The sole other occurrence of the adjective μικρομέγας is in the *inventarium* of the *Acta Monasterii Theotoci Eleusae* (Strumica, Macedonia), where it describes "big and small basket-shaped lamps" (κανίσκια μικρομέγας): see Petit (1900) 124 l. 3, translated by A. Bandy and N. Ševčenko in Thomas et al. (2000) 1674. The date of this *inventarium* is uncertain, maybe 1164 or 1449: see Thomas et al. (2000) 1668 n. 1. Cf. also μεγάλος in Philo Judaeus, *De Josepho* 142. The codd. Paris. suppl. gr. 95 (xiv cent.) and Mon. gr. 546 (1505) have the inscription Ἰωάννου γραμματικοῦ τοῦ Τζέτζου τὰ πρὸ Ὀμήρου, τὰ Ὀμήρου, καὶ τὰ μέθ' Ὀμηρον ἐν συντόμῳ καλῶς ἐκδοθέντα, copied by Schirach (1770) in his partial edition based on the Munich manuscript. Schirach rendered it as "*Carmina Iliaca*", the title still in use—"Iliacum carmen" had been the designation for a small fragment of the poem published as anonymous by Morel (1616). Tychsen (1788), who integrated Schirach's edition of *antehomerica*, maintained *Carmina Iliaca*, while Jacobs (1793), who gave the first complete edition, and Bekker (1816) opted for *Antehomerica*, *Homerica et Posthomerica*. A survey of previous editions is available in Leone (1986) 295–298.

- 13 See Braccini (2009–2010) 154. The title is plainly based on *Ilias parva* (see below §5).

- 14 See Leone (1984a) 385–386.

as well as in the *Exegesis* on Aristophanes' *Frogs* and the reading of its verses, which flow without interruption, leave no doubt about the unity of the poem.¹⁵

Tzetzēs reveals his aim as ποιητής in the very first scholium:

ὁ παρὼν ποιητής, φιλοσύντομος ὦν καὶ τῆς ὠφελείας τῶν νέων φροντίζων, συνοπτικῶς τὴν πᾶσαν Ἰλιάδα ἐν τῇ παρούσῃ βίβλῳ ἐξέθετο. φιλόμηρος δὲ εἴπερ τις ἄλλος τελῶν, ἐπειδὴ τινὰς εὔρισκε τὸν Ὅμηρον λέγοντας δαιμονιώδεις δοξάζειν θεοὺς, οὐ μὴν δὲ τὰς ψυχικὰς δυνάμεις καὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας καὶ τὰ στοιχεῖα καὶ τοὺς σοφοὺς ἐνίοτε καὶ τοὺς βασιλεῖς λέγειν θεοὺς, τοῦτο δεικνὺς καὶ ἀνατρέπων τὸν λῆρον αὐτῶν, χριστιανικώτατος ὦν καὶ ἐν τοῖς ἡμετέροις χρόνοις Καλλιόπας καὶ Μούσας καὶ θεοὺς φησι καὶ αὐτός, δεικνὺς πάντως ἐκ τούτων ὡς καὶ Ὅμηρος οὕτω ταῦτα πάντα ἐλάμβανεν.

This poet, loving conciseness and concerning himself with helping the young, has synoptically laid out the whole *Iliad* in this book. Since he particularly loves Homer, and he found some people saying that Homer believed in daemon-like gods—as opposed to naming as “gods” the psychic faculties, the stars and elements, and sometimes the wise men and kings—, by showing this fact and refuting their nonsense, while being absolutely Christian, yet he also tells of Calliopes and Muses and gods in our times, and so demonstrates in every respect how Homer himself conceived all these things in that way.

schol. Carm. Il. p. 101 L.

Young students are the addressees of the poet Tzetzēs, who writes for their advantage. He explicitly refers to them at the end of the poem, where he invites “the sons of fortunate parents” (ὕμεις, τέκνα μοιρηγενέων γενετήρων) to look for another scholar who can easily narrate the *nostoi* of the Achaeans—he has now to come to an end because of poverty and the labour required to proceed (3.753–760). Brevity and attention to what is useful to his audience are recurring themes in Tzetzēs’ writings: along with clarity, they are the label of the teacher and of the rhetor.¹⁶ But what this scholium declares to us is that

15 See Tzetz. *Exeg. Aristoph. Ran.* 897a (11 recension), pp. 954.18–955.4 Koster, where Tzetzēs lists his works according to their stylistic features and records the *Carmina Iliaca* as ἡρωϊδαμίαν, “one composition in hexameters”.

16 See e.g. Tzetz. *Exeg. Il. proll.* pp. 3.6–9 (none of the previous exegetes mind the profit of the young and collect an overall commentary on the *Iliad* in one book), with Cesaretti (1991) 130, and *Exeg. Op.* 596a C. = 594, p. 347.23–27 G. (on bad teachers like Proclus, who deafen young students with inopportune words used only to conceal their shortcomings

Tzetzes writes as *poietes* about Iliadic matter, using the same mythic allegories as Homer, in order to make clear what the ancient poet himself did, namely that he did not believe in the gods he told of, as someone asserts, but believed that those gods were allegories.¹⁷ Tzetzes is Christian, but acts the ancient poet to show how μῦθος ἀλληγορικός is only a refined, rhetorical device peculiar to epic poets, namely the most important:

ποιηται δὲ ἀνωνύμως καὶ κατ' ἐξοχὴν ἐκεῖνοι καλοῦνται, οὕσπερ ταῦτα χαρακτηρίζει τὰ τέσσαρα· μέτρον ἡρωικόν, μῦθος ἀλληγορικός, ἱστορία ἥτοι παλαιὰ ἀφήγησις, καὶ ποιά λέξις, ἡγοῦν ἡρωικὴ καὶ ἀξιωματικὴ καὶ τῷ ἡρωικῷ μέτρῳ ἀρμόζουσα, ἀλλὰ μὴ κατατετριμμένη καὶ χθαμαλή· μάλλον δὲ ἐκ τῶν τεσσάρων τούτων ὁ ἀλληγορικός μῦθος τὸ κυριώτατόν ἐστι τῶν ποιητῶν χαρακτηρίσµα.

Those who are characterized by the following four elements are named “poets” anonymously and *par excellence*: hexametric verse, allegorical myth, history i.e. ancient narration, and specific language, that is a heroic and dignified diction and suited to hexameters, not trite and ordinary; more precisely, among these four aspects the allegorical myth is the most important feature of poets.¹⁸

Exeg. Op. proll. 60–66 c. = p. 13.7–14 G.

as exegetes) and 596b c. = 594, p. 348.7 G. (Tzetzes writes plainly for his audience's advantage). σαφήνεια, “clarity”, and συντομία, “conciseness”, are two of the four virtues of narrative: see *schol. Carm. Il.* 1.20; *proll. de Com.* xi.1.61–65; *Hist.* 12.561–584 (where Tzetzes disputes with Aphth. *Rhet. Progym.* 2, p. 3.3–4 Rabe), and e.g. Athan. *Soph. proll. in Hermog. Stat.* p. 177.14–16 Rabe and Nünlist (2009) 56 n. 106, 208–209.

- 17 See also *schol. Carm. Il.* 1.34c. On his criticism of Psellos' allegorical interpretation of Homeric gods as angels, see *scholl.* 2.27a, 34, and *Alleg. Il.* 4.47–49, *Alleg. Od. prooem.* 53, with Cesaretti (1991) 129–140 and Braccini (2009–2010) 161–162. Tzetzes sparsely refers to Christian principles in reading ancient literature: see e.g. on the providence, which corresponds to pagan εἰμαρμένη, “destiny”, *Exeg. Op.* 563 c. = p. 331.22–23 G., and on the Paradise, related to Elysium, *Exeg. Op.* 171 c. = 169, p. 142.20–23 G.; other examples from the *Allegories* in Goldwyn—Konnini (2015) xiv. Cf. Morgan (1983) 178: Tzetzes “does not mix Christianity in his Homer”.
- 18 On the four features of epic poets see also *Exeg. Il. proll.* pp. 44.17–45.6 and 1 p. 75.14–16 P.; *Exeg. Lycophr. proll.* pp. 1.19–2.3 Sch.; *Exeg. Opp. Hal. proll.* p. 260, col. 2.15–16 B., with Braccini (2011), esp. 43–45. Tzetzes' list was well-known: a later hand (m^c) copied it (from the scholia on Oppian) on the Homeric codex Marc.gr. z 613 (coll. 868; XIII cent.): see Pontani (2005a) 249.

3 The Gods

The allegorical meanings of gods listed by Tzetzes in the first scholium correspond to the three ways in which myths could be interpreted according to him: ψυχικῶς, στοιχειακῶς, πραγματικῶς (“psychologically”, i.e. connecting them with the motions of the soul; “physically”, i.e. relating them with elements, celestial bodies, atmospheric phenomena etc.; “pragmatically”, i.e. linking them with factual, veridical history).¹⁹ He proves these three levels of interpretation in the poem: for instance, the withdrawal of Hera, Athena, and Ares from the fighting (Hom. *Il.* 5.699–909) becomes the break of Diomedes’ tricks and Hector’ force (*Carm. Il.* 2.107–111 and *schol.* 2.109); Athena sent by Zeus to rekindle the battle (Hom. *Il.* 4.73–78) turns into the comet to which Homer compares her (*Carm. Il.* 2.24–25 and *schol.* 2.25b); Zeus of Crete—where Menelaus goes leaving Paris alone at Sparta—is the king Asterios (1.100–106).²⁰ Furthermore, Tzetzes creates his own allegories, as in 2.275–293, where he describes the rise of the dawn and the alternation of night and day as enmity between Nyx and her daughter Eos: in the related scholium he admits that “this whole poetic myth has been invented by me.”²¹ In 2.467–468, he depicts the great sorrow of humans and even of earth and sky during Hector’s exequies, writing that “for grief, Phoebus Apollo disappeared into the clouds; also Zeus cried softly, and the huge earth bellowed.”²² The related scholium reveals that this is a rhetorical creation by him:

τὴν συμβᾶσαν ἐπὶ τῇ τελευτῇ Ἑκτορος γενέσθαι σκότῳσιν τῶν νεφῶν καὶ τὴν μικρὰν ἐπομβρίαν καὶ τῆς γῆς τὰ μυκήματα, γλυκύτητι ἅμα καὶ ῥητόρων

19 On the meanings of *theos* see at least *Exeg. Il. proll.* pp. 45.9–55.10 P.; *Exeg. Op.* 1–4 C. = 1, p. 35.16–36.11 G.; *schol. Alleg. Il. prooem.* 314, pp. 600.15–602.7 M. On Tzetzes’ allegorical method see Hunger (1954) 44–52 and (1955a) 4–5; Cesaretti (1991) 145–204.

20 Cf. also on Hera and Athena = δέλοι of Diomedes, and Ares = θυμός of Hector *Alleg. Il.* 6.3–7; on Athena = ἀστὴρ κομήτης *Alleg. Il.* 4.66–69; on Zeus = Asterios *Hist.* 1.476–481.

21 *schol.* 2.285a, p. 198.14–15 L.: τὸ δὲ ὅλον τοῦτο ποιητικὸς μῦθος ἐστὶ πλασθεὶς παρ’ ἐμοῦ. The passage has been analysed by Braccini (2009–2010) 162–163. Cesaretti (1991) 147 underlined that “la novità dell’allegorismo di Tzetze non sta nell’individuazione di queste tre vie del mito, ma nel suo procedimento di contestualizzazione, dove l’elemento mitico viene limitato al campo specifico del linguaggio poetico di Omero (e non della sapienza ellenica, come in Psello).” See also Kaldellis (2007) 246 and (2009) 27.

22 πένθει δ’ ἐν νεφέεσσιν ἐδύσατο Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων· / ἡρέμα δάκρυσε καὶ Ζεὺς, μῦκε δὲ γαῖα πελώρη (*Carm. Il.* 2.467–468).

δεινότητι περιθέμενος αἴσθησιν τῷ ἡλίῳ Ἀπόλλωνι καὶ τῷ Διὶ οὐρανῷ καὶ τῇ γῇ,
 φημί κρύψιν Ἀπόλλωνος ἐν τοῖς νέφεσι καὶ Διὸς δάκρυα διὰ πένθος γεγονότα
 "Ἑκτορος.

By using rhetors' sweetness and eloquence, I give feelings to the sun, Apollo, and to the sky, Zeus, and to the earth; and I call the darkening of the clouds occurring because of Hector's death and the light rain and the earth's roars Apollo's disappearance into the clouds and Zeus' tears, due to the grief for Hector.

schol. 2.467, pp. 208.15–109.2 L.

Myths involving gods only have a rhetorical meaning.²³ In the plot of the *Carmina Iliaca*, their presence is reduced to an embellishment, and gods do not influence the action as in the *Iliad*. Consider for instance how Tzetzes condenses the long episode of the duel between Diomedes and Aeneas (Hom. *Il.* 5.297–453): the intervention of Aphrodite and Apollo in defence of Aeneas becomes the poetic image of Aeneas' loss of desire for fighting and his flight into the temple of the sun (*Carm. Il.* 2.72–77). Tzetzes' interest—and that of his contemporaries—is devoted to the *historia*, to the events that were recognized as part of the world history.²⁴

4 The Tale of the Trojan War

A sketch of the content of the *Carmina Iliaca* is given in the prologue, where Tzetzes invokes the Muse of epic poetry, asking for a recount of the Trojan War:

ἀργαλέου πολέμοιο μέγαν πόνον Ἰλιακοῖο
 ἔννεπε, Καλλιόπεια, ὕφ' ἡμετέρησιν αἰοδαῖς,
 ἀρχήθε δ' ἐπάειδε καὶ ἐς τέλος ἐξερέεινε,
 ἐξ ὅτεο Πρίαμος λοιγὸν Τρώεσσι φυτεύει
 5 Δύσπαριν οὐλόμενον, ἀρχὴν πολέμοιο κακοῖο,
 τὴν νόος οὐκ ἐρέεινεν Ὀμήρου κυδαλίμοιο.
 ἔννεπε δ' Ἀργεῖης Ἑλένης ἐρόεσσαν ὀπωπὴν,

23 Myths and *exempla* give "sweetness" to discourse: see Hermog. *Id.* pp. 330–339 (esp. 330.18–23) Rabe; Men. Rh. *De Enc.* 389.12–17 Russell-Wilson.

24 See Cupane (2008) 254–255. In the chronicle of Manasses, a contemporary of Tzetzes, there are no gods in the account of the Trojan War (vv. 1108–470): see Browning (1992) 141; Pontani (2005a) 163 and below § 6.

- πῶς τέ μιν ἦγεν Ἀλέξανδρος Σπάρτηθε Τροίην.
 ἔννεπε δὲ πλόον Ἑλλήνων καὶ νῆας ἀπάσας·
 10 εἰπὲ δὲ Πηλεΐδαο κότον καὶ ὄλεθρον Ἀχαιῶν,
 Σαρπηδόντος Πατρόκλου τε καὶ Ἑκτορος οἶτον·
 εἰπὲ δὲ Πενθεσίλειαν, κόρυην ἀντιάνειραν.
 ἔννεπε δ' Αἰθίοπων στρατὸν υἷά τε Ἑριγενείης.
 φράζεο δ' Αἰακίδαο πότμον δακρυόεντα·
 15 Εὐρύπυλόν τε αἶδε καὶ υἷα Αἰακίδαο
 μαντείας θ' Ἑλένου καὶ Ἀλεξάνδροιο φονῆα.
 εἰπὲ δὲ καὶ πτολίπορθον Ἐπειοῦ δούρεον ἵππον,
 εἰσόκεν ἦϊστωσε πελώρια τεύχεα Τροίης.
 ταῦτά μοι εὐπατέρεια, Διὸς τέκος, ἔννεπε Μοῦσα.

Tell, Calliope, of the great trouble of the painful Trojan War, through my verses; sing it from the beginning and explore it until the end, from the time when Priam gives birth to the ruin of the Trojans, the accursed Dysparis, the start of the evil war, which the mind of the illustrious Homer did not investigate. Tell of the lovely appearance of the Argive Helen, and how Alexander brought her from Sparta to Troy. Tell of the fleet of the Hellenes and all the ships. Tell of Peleides' rancour and the ruin of the Achaeans, the fate of Sarpedon, and of Patroclus, and of Hector; and tell of Penthesileia, the girl that opposes men.²⁵ Tell of the army of the Ethiopians and the son of Erigeneia. Show the tearful fate of the Aeacides; sing Eurypylus and the son of the Aeacides and Helenus' prophecies and the murderer of Alexander. Tell also of the city wasting, wooden horse of Epeius, until it destroyed the mighty walls of Troy. Muse, daughter of a noble sire, child of Zeus, tell me these events.

1.1–19

In accordance with this summary, the plot of the poem can be outlined as follows. The tale of Paris' birth and Helen's abduction (1.40–153) is preceded by a little introduction about the previous sufferings of the Trojans (Heracles' sack and the Amazons' assault) and the Moirai's decision about a new pain for them (1.20–39); it is followed by a short account of the first phases of the

25 I translate the epithet *antianeira* according to Tzetzes' explanation: ἀντιάνειραν τὴν ἐναντιοῦμένην ἀνδράσιν, πολεμικήν (*schol.* 1.12a, p. 105.12 L.). The proper meaning is "equal to men", but ancient Homeric exegetes interpreted it also as "opponent to men": see e.g. *schol.* D Hom. *Il.* 3.189, p. 146 van Thiel; Apoll. Soph. *Lexicon Homericum* p. 31.16–18; with Blok (1995) 160–164, 169–185.

war (1.154–285), which lead to Palamedes' death, the true reason for Achilles' wrath (1.286–406). The anger of Achilles (2.1–14, 228–233), Patroclus' return to the fighting (he kills Sarpedon) and his death at Hector's hands (2.219–227), and Achilles killing of Hector, with the Trojans' claim to his corpse and the exequies (2.240–490) are the central events narrated by Homer (corresponding to *Iliad* 1, 16–18, 22–24): the rest of the poem is abridged in vv. 15–218 (*Iliad* 2–15) and 234–239 (*Iliad* 19–21), with a focus on battles and killings. Tzetzes devotes the major part of the *Carmina Iliaca* to the *posthomerica*, which are also well summarized in the prologue: the two great heroes who come to help the Trojans, Penthesileia (3.1–211) and Memnon (3.212–350); Achilles' death (3.351–480); the deeds of Eurypylus and Neoptolemus, who eventually kills Eurypylus (3.518–568); Helenus' prophecies that call for the return of Philoctetes with his arrows, which shot Paris dead (3.569–601); the building of the wooden horse and the capture of Troy (3.629–743). A few lines recount of the dispute over the arms of Achilles with Ajax' suicide, Polyxena's death and the theft of the Palladium (3.481–517), and a second venture of Odysseus and Diomedes in Troy (3.602–628). In the epilogue, Tzetzes alludes to the Achaeans' *nostoi* and gives chronological information about the capture of Troy (3.744–780).

In telling this story, Tzetzes made his choices. He selects the birth of Paris as starting point of the war, giving the beautiful Helen only a secondary role, as in Colluthus (she is never depicted negatively).²⁶ He focuses on the story of Palamedes, the wise hero who invented the letters, to whom he felt so close.²⁷ He abridges the *Iliad* plot by turning it into a list of woundings and killings, but expands on the 24th book (218 lines out of 490!) by increasing the Homeric narrative with an enlarged embassy of the Trojan royal family to Achilles (the appeals of Priamus, Andromache, and Polyxena) and the long cortege mourning on Hector's corpse.²⁸ Tzetzes shows his fondness for retelling the *Posthomerica*, in particular the stories of Penthesileia and Memnon—those

26 Paris' birth is the instrument of fate to cause the Trojan War: see *Carm. Il.* 1.5, 30–31, 38–39 and *Exeg. Il. proll.* pp. 59.17–60.2 P., where Tzetzes states his preference for the story that starts with Hecuba's dream and Paris' birth. His sources are Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.12.5 and Io.Mal. 5.1–2 Thurn: see Patzig (1901) 386–387. Cf. also Manasses 119–1149, with E. Jeffreys (1979) 211–212, 228–229 about Manasses' relationship with Tzetzes. On Colluthus' negative portrait of Paris (he is ὁ ἀρχέκακος πολίτης, v. 392) see Magnelli (2008) and Paschalis (2008) 142–143. On Tzetzean allegory of the judgment of Paris see below § 5.

27 On Tzetzes' love for Palamedes see Duchataux (1901) 248–249; Braccini (2009–2010) 167–168; Pontani (2009) 12. On Palamedes' death as the cause of Achilles' anger see also *schol.* 2.2 and Leone (1984a) 389–391.

28 Note the simile that depicts Achilles' emotion: at the sight of Hector's children (they are

narrated by Quintus of Smyrna, his main source here—with a lively narrative enriched with similes: Penthesileia holds a shield adorned with a picture of herself disputed between Ares and Eros (3.63–72); a rhetorical question opens the simile that describes the carnage of the Achaeans, whose corpses cover the plain of Troy as snow due to Boreas/Penthesileia blowing (3.103–110); Ajax and Memnon go head to head like the bulls depicted by the pseudo-Oppian (3.320–328 with *schol.* 3.320, see [Opp.] *Cynegetica* 2.43–71).²⁹ In these passages we see the author: Tzetzes decides how to tell the story—he does not write a plain summary—and plays with the typical elements of epic narrative (as in his aforementioned allegorical creations). “Erudite invention” is the happy term coined by Tommaso Braccini to define the *Carmina Iliaca*: inventiveness and learning coexist in this work both scholarly and poetic.³⁰

5 The Voice of the Muse: Tzetzes’ Learning

The account of the Trojan War starts, as we have seen, with the suffering previously experienced by Troy: “Certainly, Troy suffered for wars before” (1.20).³¹ In *schol.* 1.20a, Tzetzes remarks that the Muse, allegory of knowledge, is personified and supposed to speak here: “The expression ἥτοι μὲν is also a personification: the poet introduces his own knowledge as a Muse that speaks and narrates.”³² In his commentary on the *Iliad*, Tzetzes explains that epic poets used

two: see below § 5), he pales and restrains his tears as when clouds cover the sun, but wind (= Achilles’ *thymos*) impedes rain (2.368–380).

- 29 The picture on Penthesileia’s shield seems to have no parallels: see Braccini (2009–2010) 170–171. It might be inspired by Quintus of Smyrna’s description of Penthesileia’s arrival at Troy (*Posthom.* 1.18–61), where the heroine is said as beautiful as the goddesses (v. 19) but with the spirit of a warrior (v. 27); *charis* and *alke* are blended in her face (v. 61): see Vian (1963) 14 n. 4; Bär (2009) 238–239. On Amazons in Byzantium see Dostálová (1993). On Borea simile cf. Hom. *Il.* 19.357–364. On Oppian’s description of the fight between two bulls, note that he compares the crash of their horns to the collision between two ships during a naval battle: symmetrically, Tzetzes compares the crash of the shields of Ajax and Memnon to the smash of bulls’ horns. Other similes are in *Carm. Il.* 2.46–51 (see Braccini [2009–2010] 158–160), 259–263, 470–477; 3.269–278, 300–301, 398–400, 567–568. In 2.179 a Homeric simile (*Il.* 8.247–251) is abridged into one hexameter. For Tzetzes’ treatment of Homeric similes in the *Allegories* see Godlwyn-Kokkini (2015) xviii–xx.

- 30 See Braccini (2009–2010), esp. 171.

- 31 ἥτοι μὲν Τροίῃ πολέμοις πρότερον μογέεσκε (*Carm. Il.* 1.20).

- 32 ἔστι δὲ τὸ “ἥτοι μὲν” καὶ προσωποποιᾷ: τὴν γὰρ ἰδίαν γνώσιν ὡς Μοῦσάν τινα παρεισάγει λέγουσαν καὶ διηγουμένην (p. 108.20–22 L.).

to do it, as Orpheus, who comes from the Thracian district of Libethron, shows in saying: “‘And now, Muse, maid from Libethron, tell me’, instead of ‘O knowledge of me who is Libethrian’” (*Exeg. Il.* 1.1, p. 75.7–8 P.).³³ This Muse/knowledge invoked by poets “is not the natural and untaught intelligence”: it is “the knowledge acquired through education” (Tzetz. *Exeg. Op.* 1.110–111 C. = p. 29.13–14 G.).³⁴ Hence, the *Carmina Iliaca* are not an impersonal narrative: there is a specific voice speaking, the voice of the learned teacher and scholar Tzetzes.³⁵

Tzetzes breaks into the story not only by retelling his own personal experiences with evil women and wretched employers—the aforementioned events at Berroia—but especially by underlining his own interpretations of myths and his investigations of ancient sources.³⁶ For example, in 1.65–75, where he

33 “νῦν δ’ ἄγε μοι, κούρη Λειβηθριάς, ἔννεπε Μοῦσα”, ἀντὶ τοῦ, “ὦ γνώσις ἐμοῦ τοῦ Λειβηθρίου”, quoting Max. Περὶ καταρχῶν 141 (‘Orph.’ fr. 771a Bernabé). See also *Exeg. Il. proll.* p. 46.15–47.5 P.; *Alleg. Il.* 1.4–5, 2.113–114; *Alleg. Od.* 1.33. In the scholium on Hom. *Il.* 1, after the words quoted above, Tzetzes imitates Orpheus’ verse: “as I, too, could say in like manner: ‘and now, Muse, maid from Constantinople, tell me’” (ὥσπερ ἂν ἴσως εἶπον καὶ γὰρ· “νῦν δ’ ἄγε μοι, κούρη Κωνσταντιάς, ἔννεπε Μοῦσα”, p. 75.5–10 P.). This fictitious line by Tzetzes is still published as Orph. fr. 771c Bernabé, for the reason that previous editions of Tzetzes’ exegesis was based on a manuscript (Lips. gr. 32, XIV–XV cent.) that omits the words from νῦν δ’ ἄγε μοι (beginning of Orpheus’ line) to καὶ γὰρ (before Tzetzes’ line) due to a *saut du même au même*: see Hermann (1812) 50.14–15 and Bachmann (1835) 775.36–38. On Orpheus and Libethron cf. at least Tzetz. *Hist.* 6.941–944. The same pattern—with the Muse Calliope = the poet’s knowledge invoked at the beginning of the poem and then personified and supposed to speak when the narrative starts—is outlined for Hom. *Od.* 1.1 and 11 by *scholl. Hom. Od.* 1.1j and 11a.1–3, pp. 7, 21 Pontani. On the Muse as personal knowledge of the poet cf. also Eust. *Il.* 1.1, I p. 15.21–23 van der Valk; Eust. *Od.* 1.10, p. 36.3–4 Cullhed; *schol. T Hes. Theog.* 116b, p. 22.15–16 Di Gregorio.

34 Μοῦσα μὲν ἐστὶν ἡ διὰ παιδεύσεως γνώσις, οὐχ ἡ αὐτοφυῆς καὶ ἀδίδακτος φρόνησις. The long note on Hes. *Op.* 1 (pp. 24.24–34.22 G.) is a small treatise on the Muses and their allegorical meaning; here, Tzetzes’ allegory of the Muse/Muses as knowledge is largely explored (a passage is translated in Pontani [2015] 380–381). Cf. *Alleg. Il.* 2.113–114: εἴτα πάλιν ὁ Ὀμηρος καὶ πρὸς τὰς Μοῦσας λέγει, / τὴν γνώσιν πάντως τὴν αὐτοῦ τὴν ἐκ τῶν μαθημάτων.

35 As Cullhed (2014a) 34–35 brilliantly underlined, “Eustathios and Tzetzes ... both propagate ideas found in Imperial age texts claiming that Homer re-used works of previous writers ... the poet is presented as a professional writer working from various written sources ... Homer, according to this view, operated under condition not very different from those of Tzetzes himself when he produced his *Antehomerica*, *Homerica* and *Posthomerica*.”

36 On the allusions to Berroia episode, Kaldellis (2009) 26 noted that: “these bitter digressions, dubiously linked to the Trojan War, illustrate Tzetzes’ inability to keep his troubles and comically annoying personality out of his scholarship.” See also M. Jeffreys (1974) 149. Braccini (2010) underlined how the wound on his pride affected Tzetzes’ narration of the

reveals the real meaning of the judgment of Paris,³⁷ i.e. his peculiar and well-known allegory that identifies Paris with a rhetor composing a treatise on the origin of cosmos.³⁸ In telling of Helen's capture and of the enmity between Odysseus and Palamedes, Tzetzes stresses that the mythical versions followed by him are the true ones: "Many err in this way, upsetting history; but I told with all accuracy, how each of these events happened. All other tales are nonsense" (1.151–153); "All these tales are false ... I will tell the truth, as it happened," (1.308, 310).³⁹ Orpheus has taught him not to lie to men.⁴⁰ This truthful narration is the outcome of a learned inquiry into ancient sources. Tzetzes can openly argue with them, as just seen; however, he can also present different versions without disputing, simply proving the breadth of his knowledge (especially in the *posthomerica*).⁴¹ In the proem of his *Allegories on the Iliad*, Tzetzes

Trojan War: he gave some place to the theme of devoted women contrasted with adulteresses, as evident from the episode of Laodamia, who committed suicide because of Protesilaus' death, followed by Tzetzes' praise and catalogue of virtuous ancient women, opposed to "the shameless, wild women, Phylonomai, Phaedrai, and painful Stheneboeai" (see *Carm. Il.* 1.227–245; quoted words: ἀναιδέες, ἀγριόθυμοι, / Φυλονόμαι, Φαῖδραι Σθενέβοιαι τ' ἀλγεόδωροι, vv. 244–245).

- 37 αὐτὰρ ἐμοὶ δοκεῖ τὸδε λώϊον ἔμμεναι ἄλλο, "however, the following, different interpretation seems better to me" (*Carm. Il.* 1.65).
- 38 See more in detail *Exeg. Il. prol.* pp. 61.17–65.1 P. and *Alleg. Il. prooem.* 235–315 M. = 236–316 B., with E. Jeffreys (1978) 126–131. In *Carm. Il.* 1.65, Tzetzes objects to the allegory of Paris as rhetor composing only an encomium to Aphrodite as desire (ἐπιθυμία); in *Alleg. Il. prooem.* 241–248, he explains that this interpretation, for which he mentions John of Antioch (John Malalas of Antioch: see Tzetz. *schol. Alleg. Il. prooem.* 245 M. = 246 B. and Io. Mal. 5.2, ll. 25–34 Thurn), is inferior because it neglects some elements of the story, such as the wedding of Peleus and Thetis. When Tzetzes mentions John of Antioch, he always alludes to John Malalas: see Patzig (1901); Roberto (2005) 163.
- 39 ὥς ἄρα πολλοὶ πλάζονθ' ἱστορίην στροβέοντες / αὐτὰρ ἐγὼν ἐρέεινα πανατρεκέως ἀγορεύων, / ὥς κεν ἕκαστα γέγοντο. τὰ δ' ἄλλ' ἀνεμώλια πάντα (*Carm. Il.* 1.151–153); ψεύδεα πάντα τέτυκται ... ταῦτα δέ τοι ἐρέω νημερτέα, ὥς περ ἐτύχθη (1.308, 310). In the first passage, Tzetzes disputes with Lycophron (112–143), Colluthus (202–205) and Stesichorus (*PMGF* 192): see *scholl.* 1.147, 149.
- 40 Ὀρφεὺς γάρ με δίδαξεν ... "ψευδεᾶ μή ποτε μῦθον ἐνισπεῖν ἀνθρώποισιν" (3.705–706, see Orph. *Lithica* 400–402, quoted in *schol.* 3.705). Here, Tzetzes disagrees with Triphiodorus, according to whom the capture of Troy did not happen in winter, but in spring (as in other sources): see 3.700–701 with *schol.* 3.700, and on Tzetzes' dating of Troy's fall 3.761–780 with ancient sources discussed in Fowler (2013) 543–545. On the truth as "unico arduo scopo della sua [*scil.* of Tzetzes] ricerca" see Luzzatto (1999) 155–156.
- 41 In addition to the quoted passages, different versions of myths are offered in 2.244–254 (on Hector's death); 3.13–16 (on Penthesileia coming to Troy), 209–211 (about Penthesileia's

says to his patroness that, from him, she could learn all about the Trojan War: “as if you had read Homers, Stesichoruses, Euripidolycophrons, Colluthuses and Lescheses, and Dictys, who wrote a good *Iliad*, Triphiodoruses and Quintus.”⁴² These are his own sources for the writing of *Carmina Iliaca*, with the addition especially of Flavius Philostratus’ *Heroicus*, Orpheus’ *Lithica*, Apollodorus’ *Bibliotheca* and the Byzantine chronicle of John Malalas. From Lesches, Tzetzes stole one line transmitted by a scholium on Euripides’ *Hecuba* 910 (*Ilias parva* fr. 11 Davies = 9 Bernabé = 14 West, used twice in 3.720, 733: see *schol.* 3.720), and he is the only source of a line from Stesichorus’ *Palinode* (*PMGF* 192, *ap. schol.* 1.149, cf. also *Exeg. Lycoph.* 113).⁴³ Tzetzes often displays his learning in minute observations, for example about the children of Hector and Andromache (two: 2.318–319, 734) and of Helen and Paris (four: 3.442).⁴⁴ Sometimes, he plays with his knowledge, e.g. when he notes that Eos’ chariot was drawn by the two horses Lampus and Phaethon, and “furthermore, there was Pegasus, the newly gained horse running by their side” (3.137–139).⁴⁵ As he explains in the related scholium (3.138a), he is joking, by conflating Homeric and post-Homeric traditions: “Here, I wrote a witty remark: Homer says that Eos’ horses are Lampus and Phaethon, but the *neoterói* Pegasus. For this reason I wittily called Pegasus *neoktetos*, ‘newly gained.’”⁴⁶ Furthermore, just as he creates mythical allegories,

corpse), 429–430 (about Achilles’ corpse), 503 (on Polyxena’s fate), 521–522 and 584 (on Machaon’s death), 532–533 (on Odysseus and Neoptolemos), 571–575 (about Helenus coming to the Achaeans), 597–598 (on the death of Paris’ first wife), 601 (about Deiphobus marrying Helen after Paris’ death). In particular, Tzetzes expresses his disagreement with Quintus (on the dialogue between Memnon and Nestor, ironically mentioned in 3.282–283, and on Machaon: as claimed by Quintus, he is killed by Eurypylus and does not treat Philoctetes’ injury) and with Tryphiodorus (according to him, Penthesileia was buried with due honours by Achilles, not thrown into the Scamander by Diomedes, see also *schol.* 3.211), who are his main sources for the *posthomérica*. Further disputes are revealed in the scholia: e.g. on the Amazons’ number—12 for Quintus, as stated in 3.12, more for Tzetzes—see *scholl.* 3.23 and 3.184.

42 οὕτως ὡς ἂν ἀνέγνωκας Ὀμήρους, Στησιχόρους, / Εὐριπίδολυκόφρονας, Κολλούθους τὲ καὶ Λέσχας, / καὶ Δίκτυν συγγραψάμενον καλῶς τὴν Ἰλιάδα, Τριφιδώρους, Κόϊντον (*Alleg. Il. pro-oem.* 479–482 M. = 480–483 B.).

43 On Tzetzes’ sources see the detailed analysis by Leone (1984a) 387–405. On Lesches’ line used in the poem see Braccini (2009–2010) 157. On Stesichorus and Tzetzes see Leone (1984c) 250; Cingano—Gentili (1984), Pardini (1993) 114–116 and Ercoles (2013) 48–49.

44 See Braccini (2009–2010) 158 and Leone (1984a) 392, respectively. The “erudite component” of the poem is analysed in Braccini (2009–2010) 157–160.

45 Πήγασος αὐτε νεόκτητος παρήρορος ἦεν.

46 παίζων δὲ ἐνταῦθα γέγραφα· Ὀμηρος γάρ ἵππους Ἡμέρας Λάμπων καὶ Φαέθοντα λέγει, οἱ δὲ

so too can he fashion erudite information, such as the names of the Amazons following Penthesileia: he lists twenty of them, killed by the Achaeans (3.177–184), and admits (*schol.* 3.183a) that their telling names “are forged by me for their praiseworthy riding talent and opposing men and the skill of archery and the remaining abilities in fighting.”⁴⁷

As evident from these and previous examples, the scholia appended by Tzetzes to his own poetic text are not intended only for the explanation of learned material. Of course, we find the voice of the teacher, who explains rhetorical, grammatical and metrical features; integrates mythical information; specifies allusions to different versions; and expands Iliadic summaries. But we also have the voice of the author, who clarifies his choices, and reveals his care for the text, as when in *schol.* 1.195a Tzetzes claims to have noticed that he has forgotten what he had written in the prologue (the promise to tell of all the Greek ships: 1.9), and so he has added to the margin a line about the Achaeans’ fleet (actual v. 1.192).⁴⁸ Moreover, scholia can also become an avenue for inventiveness: in his annotations, Tzetzes usually quotes epigrams from the pseudo-Aristotelian *Peplus* in memory of dead heroes (see e.g. on Achilles *schol.* 3.465 = [Arist.] *Pepl.* 4–5 Rose); for nine of them, having found no ancient epitaphs, he creates new epigrams.⁴⁹ Scholia are intrinsically separate from each other; however, some cross-references show that they were intended as a commentary, as a whole organically linked to the poetic text, like Tzetzes’ exegesis on ancient poets.⁵⁰ The *Carmina Iliaca* appear to be a work of poetry even in this respect.

νεώτεροι Πήγασον· διὰ τοῦτο ἀστείζόμενος νεόκτητον εἶπον τὸν Πήγασον (p. 217.6–8 L.). See Hom. *Od.* 23.245–246 (Lampus and Phaethon) and Lycophr. 16–17 (Pegasus) with Tzetz. ad loc., and Eust. *Il.* 11.1–2, 111 p. 135.2–4 van der Valk, with analogous wording.

47 πέπλασται παρ’ ἡμῶν εἰς ἱππικὸν αὐτῶν ἔπαινον καὶ ἀνδρῶν ἐναντίωσιν καὶ τοξικῆς ἐμπειρίαν καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν πολεμικῶν ἔργων (p. 218.11–13 L.).

48 Leone (1995) 134 *app.* states that the lemma refers to line 1.195, “sed scholium ad alium verum fortasse referendum est.” The only line concerning the Achaeans’ fleet is 1.192, which reports the total number of ships (1186), and is clearly placed between two verses earlier conceived as following each other.

49 See Leone (1985b) 293 and e.g. on Thersites *schol.* 1.207 (ἐπὶ δὲ Θερσίτῃ ἐπίγραμμα οὐ φέρεται· ἔστω δὲ τόδε κτλ.).

50 An example of cross-reference is given in *schol.* 2.23 (about comets: περὶ δὲ κομητῶν πρότερον εἶπον κτλ.), which refers back to *schol.* 1.215.

6 Meter (and Language): What Genre for the *Carmina Iliaca*?

Tzetzes' choice of writing in hexameters is not neutral. It is the epic metre, in which the poets *par excellence* composed, in particular Homer, the greatest poet, whom he is explaining to his young students. Hexameter is the most difficult quantitative verse for Byzantine writers, selected to elevate important verse composition.⁵¹ Constantine Manasses, a contemporary of Tzetzes, wrote his *Chronike synopsis* in popular political verse (Trojan War is narrated in vv. 1108–470), the same used by Tzetzes for his *Allegories on the Iliad* and on *the Odyssey* (and other popularizing writings).⁵² Isaac Porphyrogenitos, son of Alexios I and brother of Anna Comnena, openly declares in the prologue of his prose treatise *περὶ τῶν καταλειφθέντων ὑπὸ τοῦ Ὀμήρου* (“on the events omitted by Homer”) to write “not in epic metre and language, as if I copied Homer—this is a particularly laborious and extremely difficult undertaking—but with textual simplicity and in prose and with a limpid plot.”⁵³

51 “Although the ancient metres were modified, metrics and the writing of poetry became a technique whose rules could only be acquired laboriously. Writing according to these rules came to be seen as a rare pinnacle of literary achievement ... The writing of hexameters was always the greatest challenge.”, E. Jeffreys (2009) 221. The sole analysis of Tzetzes' hexameters is in Schrader (1888), concerning only vowel quantity. On Byzantine hexameters see Giannelli (1960) 354–357; Hörandner (1974) 124; Lauxtermann (1999a) 70–73 and (1999b) 367–368.

52 Manasses wrote the epigram with the dedication of the chronicle to his patroness, the Sebastokratorissa Irene, in hexameters: see Lampsidis (1996) xvii, 4; Rhoby (2006) 323–324. On Manasses and Trojan matter see Basilikopoulou-Ioannidou (1971) 92–93, 120–121; E. Jeffreys (1978) 126 and (1979) 201–229, 234–237; Browning (1992) 141; Lavagnini (1997) 53–54. On Tzetzes' attitude towards political verse (for him it “was not a meter”) see M. Jeffreys (1974) 151–157, 160–162. Tzetzes also uses technical iambs for his verse compositions: see his unfinished *Chronicle of the World*, whose preface has been edited by Hunger (1955b); *De comoedia*, Koster (1975) 94–98; *De tragoedia*, Koster (1975) 99–109 and Pace (2011); the verse annotations in Luzzatto (1999). The *De metris* is written in decapentasyllables, but its prologue and its epilogue are in hexameters; other hexameters by Tzetzes can be found in the *Historiae* (Leone [2007²] xl), among his *Iambi* (Leone [1969–1970] 144) and among some epigrams appended to his exegesis on Lycophron (p. 398.10–14 Scheer, on which see De Stefani [2014] 391–392) and to pseudo-Oppian's *Cynegetica* (p. 171.9–12 Papathomopoulos, see De Stefani cit.).

53 μὴ μέτροις ἥρωικῶν στίχων καὶ λέξεων, οἷάπερ τοῖσδε τὸν Ὀμηρον ἀπομιμησάμενοι—τοῦτο γὰρ ἐπιπόνου μάλιστα καὶ ἐργωδεστέρας ἐστὶν ἐγχειρήσεως—ἀλλ' ὕφους ἀπλότητι καὶ πεζῇ τῇ λέξει καὶ εὐκρινείᾳ τῆς ὑποθέσεως (pp. 61.24–62.2 Hinck). On Isaac Porphyrogenitus' edition of the *Iliad*, “including a preface, a text with conspicuous scholia and an appendix designed to ‘integrate’ the Homeric account of the Trojan war ... [i.e.] the two small treatises on the

Tzetzēs, however, undertook this difficult challenge. He did it surely in order to display his learning in ancient metrics—he proudly stresses his ability in *schol.* 1.124a⁵⁴—and as a means to promote his competence among the aristocrats (potential patrons and employers).⁵⁵ His competence concerned not only metre, but also the peculiar language that metre entailed. Tzetzēs’ hexameters “vary from Homeric to modern Greek vocabulary and style.”⁵⁶ There are Homeric expressions, sometimes made easier to understand: note the μέσῳ ἐνὶ νυκτὸς ἀμολγῶ of 1.127, taken from Hom. *Il.* 11.173 ἐν νυκτὸς ἀμολγῶ, with the gloss μέσῳ. There is preciousness, such as the γυιοβαρής, “weighing down the limbs”—from Aesch. *Agamemnon* 63, where it refers to Achaeans and Trojans’ hard fighting—said of Dionysus in 3.718: it condenses in half a line Triphiodorus’ description of the Trojans overcome by drunkenness (582–586). There are neologisms, like Σκυθόμητρες, “mothers of Scythians,” for the Amazons (1.22), from a myth told in the related scholium according to Herodotus (4.110–116) and Dionysius Periegetes (652–658).⁵⁷ In writing hexameters, there was the plea-

praetermissa ab Homero and on the physiognomic features of Greek and Trojan heroes”, see Pontani (2006) (quotation from p. 556). The preface is edited by Kindstrand (1979), the two treatises by Hinck (1873). See also Browning (1975) 28 and (1992) 141; Lavagnini (1997) 54–55; Pontani (2005a) 161–163 and (2015) 377–378; Kaldellis (2009) 24.

54 οὐδείς γὰρ οὐδέποτε ὥς ἡμεῖς μετρικὴν τέχνην καὶ ποιητικὴν ἡκριβώσατο, “nobody ever understood metrics and poetry better than me” (pp. 128.23–129.1 L.). On Tzetzian “productive competence”, we can notice that he sometimes appears to care for metrical refinement (e.g. lines 1.1–7 quoted above), but his hexameters are usually quite rough if compared to those of Theodore Prodromos and Nicetas Eugenianos.

55 See Braccini (2009–2010) 154–155, (2010) 89; E. Jeffreys (2009) 225: “The verse-writing is intended to demonstrate that the writer is a fully paid-up member of the notional writers’ union, that he is a credible member of the guild of *literati*. This would have been the incentive for Tzetzēs’ production of his hexameter *Carmina Iliaca* ... This must have been a factor in Theodore Prodromos’ choice of hexameters for some of his addresses to John II: a demonstration of full awareness of the heroic overtones to the metre, together with the technical competence to practice it ... these were demonstration pieces, written to display a writer’s wares and to show to two audiences his mastery of the ancient idioms. One audience ... potential patrons. The second type of audience is one that all too often is underestimated: the participants in the education process.”

56 Kaldellis (2009) 26.

57 *LBG* VII 1577 translates Σκυθόμητρες as “von skythischen Müttern”; however, Herodotus and Dionysius tell that the Scythian Sarmatians originated from the love between Amazons and Scythians. Σκυθόμητρες stands for Σκυθομήτορες (cf. e.g. μουσομήτωρ, “mother of Muses”, in Aesch. *PV* 461): the word is abridged to suit the metre (following the pattern of Δημήτερος—Δήμητρος?). See also *Hist.* 12.871–879. On γυιοβαρής cf. also anon. *Anth.Pal.* 10.12.6 = *FGE* 1393.

sure and the pride, even the arrogance, of competing with ancient writers, not only on content, but also on form.⁵⁸ It was not by chance that some lines of the *Carmina Iliaca*—the first to be published in modern era, with the related scholia—were supposed to be a fragment of ancient poetry by their editor (it was annotated epic poetry, it had to be ancient!).⁵⁹ Nevertheless, might this imitation have a deeper didactic intention? Tzetzes—it is clear from his words—does not pretend to emulate Homer, only to make his poetry accessible to his students. As Kaldellis rightly pointed out, “Tzetzes’ aim here was not to imitate Homeric morphology, vocabulary, and meter with scholarly precision (which he probably could do). It was, rather, to provide an introduction to the world of the *Iliad* in verses that could be read by a beginner.”⁶⁰ Concerning Tzetzes’ *Letters* and *Histories*, he noted that “the *Letters* are written in a more elevated Attic style, which suggests an interesting textual relationship. Tzetzes used his own letters, which are brief but dense, to teach Attic prose; he then supplemented linguistic instruction with the content of the more colloquial *Histories*, which supplied background in an easy format to students struggling with the Attic style of the letters. These works, then, are more “textbook” than “sources”, and provide a pedagogy in grammar, composition, and classical knowledge.”⁶¹ We might say the same for the *Carmina Iliaca*: the unity of poetic text and scholia, where erudition and inventiveness coexist, is constantly directed to the elucidation of the four representative features of epic poetry, and of Greek ancient literature and culture in general. It was a refined enterprise, one that must have gained some measure of success if Maximus Planudes’ circle included it in the selection of poetry of the cod. *Vaticanus Graecus* 915 (end of the XIII or beginning of the XIV cent.), and if some prose introduction to the *Iliad* (summaries of *antehomerica*) were based on it.⁶² This double mode of reception corresponds

58 See M. Jeffreys (1974) 149; Budelmann (2002) 152; Braccini (2009–2010), 165–166, 170–171 and (2011) 50–53.

59 Morel (1616) published *Carm. Il.* 1.147–295, *scholl.* 1.147, 149, 155, and partly *scholl.* 1.168, 173, as ἀποσπασμάτιον ἔπους περὶ Ἑλένης, ἀνωνύμου τινὸς παλαιοῦ καὶ ἀνωνύμου σχόλια εἰς τὸδε τὸ ποιημάτιον.

60 Kaldellis (2009) 26.

61 Kaldellis (2009) 28–29.

62 On the famous Vat. gr. 915 see Pontani (2005a) 293–297, with earlier bibliography. A *hypothesis* based on Tzetzes’ *antehomerica*, transmitted in some Iliadic codices, has been edited by Mertens (1960) 20–25 and Leone (1991b). Another prose introduction based mainly on Tzetzes’ *Allegoriae Iliadis* and *Carmina Iliaca* is available in Pontani (2009); cf. also Leone (1983–1984). On anonymous prose introductions to the *Iliad* see Pontani (2005b) 23–35.

to the double nature of the *Carmina Iliaca*: both a poetic experiment that tells the story of the whole Trojan War in the manner of Homer; and an introduction to Homeric poetry, which is the true aim of this particular work. It was the sole attempt by a Byzantine writer to compose a “continuation” of the *Iliad* in hexameters:⁶³ it could happen only in the cultural milieu of the XII century, and the scholar John Tzetzes, with his competence, didactic commitment, and outstanding personality could be the sole candidate for it.⁶⁴

Bibliography

- Agiotis, N. (2013) “Tzetzes on Psellos revisited,” *ByzZ* 106: 1–8.
- Arco Magrì, M. (1961) “Il carme inedito di Giovanni Tzetzes *De imperatore occiso*,” *BPEC* 9: 73–75.
- Bachmann, L. (ed.) (1835) *Scholia in Homeri Iliadem* 1. Lipsiae.
- Barber, Ch., and Jenkins, D. (eds.) (2009) *Medieval Greek Commentaries on the Nicomachean Ethics*. Leiden—Boston.
- Bär, S. (2009) *Quintus Smyrnaeus Posthomerica* 1. *Die Wiedergeburt des Epos aus dem Geiste der Amazonomachie, mit einem Kommentar zu den Versen 1–219*. Göttingen.
- Basilikopoulou-Ioannidou, A. (1971) ‘Η ἀναγέννησις τῶν γραμμάτων κατὰ τὸν IB’ αἰῶνα εἰς τὸ Βυζάντιον καὶ ὁ “Ὀμηρος. Athens.
- Bekker, I. (1816) *Ioannis Tzetzae Antehomerica, Homerica et Posthomerica, accedunt excerpta ex Chrestomathia Procli*. Berolini.
- Blok, J.H. (1995) *The Early Amazons. Modern and Ancient Perspectives on a Persistent Myth*. Leiden—New York—Köln.
- Boissonade, J.F. (ed.) (1851) *Tzetzae Allegoriae Iiadis. Accedunt Pselli allegoriae quarum una inedita*. Paris.
- Braccini, T. (2009–2010) “Erudita invenzione: riflessioni sulla *Piccola grande Iliade* di Giovanni Tzetzes,” *Incontri triestini di filologia classica* 9: 153–173.
- Braccini, T. (2010) “Mitografia e miturgia femminile a Bisanzio: il caso di Giovanni Tzetze,” *I quaderni del ramo d'oro online* 3: 88–105.
- Braccini, T. (2011) “Riscrivere l’epica: Giovanni Tzetzes di fronte al ciclo troiano,” *CentoPagine* 5: 43–57.

63 An overview of Byzantine poetry on Trojan matter not in classical metre, as Constantine Hermoniakos’ *Iliad* and *The Byzantine Iliad*, is available in Browning (1975) 30–33; Lavagnini (1997) 56–62; Cupane (2008) 255–256.

64 I could not have written this chapter on Tzetzes’ *Carmina Iliaca* without the patient assistance of Filippomaria Pontani and the precious help of Ettore Cingano, Enrico Magnelli and Francesco Valerio.

- Browning, R. (1975) "Homer in Byzantium," *Viator* 6: 15–33 (= Id., *Studies on Byzantine History, Literature and Education*, London 1977, n. xvii).
- Browning, R. (1992) "The Byzantines and Homer," in Lamberton and Keaney (1992) 134–148.
- Budelmann, F. (2002) "Classical Commentary in Byzantium: John Tzetzes on Ancient Greek Literature," in Gibson and Shuttleworth Kraus (2002) 141–169.
- Bussemaker, U.C. (ed.) (1849) *Scholia et paraphrases in Nicandrum et Oppianum*. Parisiis.
- Cardin, M. (ed.) (in preparation) *Ioannis Tzetzae Exegesis in Hesiodi Opera et Dies*.
- Cesaretti, P. (1991) *Allegoristi di Omero a Bisanzio*. Milano.
- Cingano, E., and Gentili, B. (1984) "Sul 'nuovo' verso della prima Palinodia di Stesicoro," *ZPE* 57: 37–40.
- Cullhed, E. (ed.) (2014a) *Eustathios of Thessalonike. Parekbolai on Homer's Odyssey 1–2. Proekdosis*. Uppsala.
- Cullhed, E. (2014b) "The Blind Bard and 'T': Homeric Biography and Authorial Personas in the Twelfth Century," *BMGs* 38: 49–67.
- Cullhed, E. (2015) "Diving for Pearls and Tzetzes' Death," *ByzZ* 108: 53–62.
- Cupane, C. (2008) "Die Homer-Rezeption in Byzanz," in Latacz, Greub, Blome and Wieczorek (2008) 251–258.
- Degani, E. (1984) *Studi su Ipponatte*. Bari.
- De Stefani, C. (2014) "The End of the 'Nonnian School'," in Spanoudakis (2014) 375–402.
- Dostálová, R. (1993) "Das Amazonenmotiv in der mittelalterlichen Epik (Byzanz—Osten—Westen)," *Byzantinoslavica* 54: 190–194.
- Duchataux, V. (1901) "Jean Tzetzés et ses études sur Homère," *Travaux de l'Académie nationale de Reims* 109: 243–277.
- Ercoles, M. (ed.) (2013) *Stesicoro: le testimonianze antiche*. Bologna.
- Fowler, R.L. (2013) *Early Greek Mythography* II. *Commentary*. Oxford.
- Gaisford, Th. (ed.) (1823²) *Poetae minores Graeci* II. Lipsiae.
- Giannelli, C. (1960) "Epigrammi di Teodoro Prodromo in onore dei santi megalomartiri Teodoro, Giorgio e Demetrio," in Vv.Aa., *Studi in onore di Luigi Castiglioni* 1. Firenze: 331–371 (= *SBN* 10 [1963]: 360–367).
- Gibson, R.G., and Shuttleworth Kraus, C. (eds.) (2002) *The Classical Commentary: Histories, Practices, Theory*. Leiden.
- Giske, H. (1881) *De Ioannis Tzetzae scriptis ac vita*. Rostochii.
- Goldwyn, A.J., and Kokkini, D. (eds.) (2015) *John Tzetzes. Allegories of the Iliad*. Cambridge (MA)—London.
- Grünbart, M. (1996) "Prosopographische Beiträge zum Briefcorpus des Ioannes Tzetzes," *JöByz* 46: 175–226.
- Grünbart, M. (2005) "Byzantinisches Gelehrtenelend—oder: Wie meistert man seinen Alltag?," in Hoffmann (2005) 413–426.

- Hart, G. (1881) "De Tzetzarum nomine vitis scriptis," *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* Supplementband 12: 18–75.
- Hermann, G. (ed.) (1812) *Draconis Stratonicensis liber De metris poeticis, Ioannis Tzetzae Exegesis in Homeri Iliadem*. Lipsiae.
- Hinck, H. (1873) *Polemo. Declamationes quae exstant duae*. Leipzig.
- Hoffmann, L.M. (ed.) (2005) *Zwischen Polis, Provinz und Peripherie. Beiträge zur byzantinischen Geschichte und Kultur*. Wiesbaden.
- Hörandner, W. (1974) *Theodore Prodromos, Historische Gedichte*. Wien.
- Hunger, H. (1954) "Allegorische Mythendeutung in der Antike und bei Johannes Tzetzes," *JöByz* 3: 35–54 (= Id., *Byzantinische Grundlagenforschung*, London 1973, n. XIV).
- Hunger, H. (1955a) "Johannes Tzetzes, Allegorien zur Odyssee, Buch 13–24," *ByzZ* 48: 4–48.
- Hunger, H. (1955b) "Johannes Tzetzes, Allegorien aus der Verschronik. Kommentierte Textausgabe," *JÖByz* 4: 13–49.
- Hunger, H. (1956) "Johannes Tzetzes, Allegorien zur Odyssee, Buch 1–12," *ByzZ* 49: 249–310.
- Jacobs, F. (1793) *Ioannis Tzetzae Antehomerica, Homerica et Posthomerica*. Lipsiae.
- Jeffreys, E.M. (1978) "The Judgement of Paris in Later Byzantine Literature," *Byzantion* 48: 112–131 (= Ead., and Jeffreys, M.J. [1983] n. VIII).
- Jeffreys, E.M. (1979) "The Attitudes of Byzantine Chroniclers towards Ancient History," *Byzantion* 49: 199–238.
- Jeffreys, E.M. (2009) "Why Produce Verse in Twelfth-Century Constantinople?" in Odo-rico, Agapitos, and Hinterberger (2009) 219–228.
- Jeffreys, E.M., and Jeffreys, M.J. (1983) *Popular Literature in Late Byzantium*. London.
- Jeffreys, M.J. (1974) "The Nature and Origins of the Political Verse," *DOP* 28: 143–195 (= Jeffreys, E.M. and Id. [1983] n. IV).
- Kaldellis, A. (2007) *Hellenism in Byzantium. The Transformation of Greek Identity and the Reception of the Classical Tradition*. Cambridge.
- Kaldellis, A. (2009) "Classical Scholarship in Twelfth-Century Byzantium," in Barber, and Jenkins (2009) 1–43.
- Kindstrand, J.F. (1979) *Isaac Porphyrogenitus. Praefatio in Homerum*. Uppsala.
- Koster, W.J.W. (ed.) (1975) *Scholia in Aristophanem*. 1A. *Prolegomena de comoedia*. Groningen.
- Lamberton, R., and Keaney, J.J. (eds.) (1992), *Homer's Ancient Readers. The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes*. Princeton.
- Lampsidis, O. (1996) *Constantini Manassis Breviarium chronicum. Pars prior, Praefationem et textum continens*. Athenis.
- Latacz, J., Greub, T., Blome, P., and Wiczorek, A. (eds.) (2008) *Homer. Der Mythos von Troia in Dichtung und Kunst*. München.

- Lauxtermann, M.D. (1999a) *The Spring of Rhythm. An Essay on the Political Verse and Other Byzantine Metres*. Wien.
- Lauxtermann, M.D. (1999b) Review of Papagiannis, G. (ed.) *Theodoros Prodromos, Jam-bische un hexametrische Tetrasticha auf die Haupterzählungen des Alten und des Neuen Testaments*, 1–11, Wiesbaden 1997, *JÖB* 49: 365–370.
- Lavagnini, R. (1997) “Storie troiane in greco volgare,” in Montanari and Pittaluga (1997) 49–62.
- Leone, P.L.M. (1969–1970) “Ioannis Tzetzae Iambi,” *RSBN* 6–7: 127–156.
- Leone, P.L.M. (1972) *Ioannis Tzetzae Epistulae*. Leipzig.
- Leone, P.L.M. (1983–1984) “Nota sulle fonti dei ΤΡΩΙΚΑ,” *Ἀθηνᾶ* 79: 213–217.
- Leone, P.L.M. (1984a) “I «Carmina Iliaca» di Giovanni Tzetzes,” *QC* 6: 377–405.
- Leone, P.L.M. (1984b) “Sulla tradizione manoscritta dei «Carmina Iliaca» di Giovanni Tzetzes IV,” *Orpheus* 5: 357–381.
- Leone, P.L.M. (1984c) “Noterelle tzetziane,” in Vv.Aa., *Lirica greca da Archiloco a Elitis. Studi in onore di Filippo Maria Pontani*, Padova: 249–258.
- Leone, P.L.M. (1985a) “Sulla tradizione manoscritta dei «Carmina Iliaca» di Giovanni Tzetzes III,” *Βυζαντινᾶ* 13: 773–786.
- Leone, P.L.M. (1985b) “Noterelle tzetziane II,” *QC* 7: 285–292.
- Leone, P.L.M. (1985c) “Noterelle tzetziane III,” *QC* 7: 293–309.
- Leone, P.L.M. (1986) “Sulla tradizione manoscritta dei «Carmina Iliaca» di Giovanni Tzetzes I,” in Vv.Aa., *Studi albanologici, balcanici, bizantini e orientali in onore di Giuseppe Valentini*, Firenze: 295–346.
- Leone, P.L.M. (1989) “Sulla tradizione manoscritta dei «Carmina Iliaca» di Giovanni Tzetzes II,” *Ἀθηνᾶ* 80: 197–219.
- Leone, P.L.M. (1991a) “Noterelle tzetziane IV,” *Rivista di bizantinistica* 1.2: 23–27.
- Leone, P.L.M. (1991b) “Un’epitome dei Carmina Iliaca di Giovanni Tzetzes,” *Rivista di bizantinistica* 1.2: 11–16.
- Leone, P.L.M. (ed.) (1995) *Ioannis Tzetzae Carmina Iliaca*. Catania.
- Leone, P.L.M. (ed.) (2007²) *Ioannis Tzetzae Historiae*. Galatina.
- Luzzatto, M.J. (1998) “Leggere i classici nella biblioteca imperiale: note tzetziane su antichi codici,” *QS* 48: 69–86.
- Luzzatto, M.J. (1999) *Tzetzes lettore di Tucide. Note autografe sul Codice Heidelberg Palatino Greco 252*. Bari.
- Luzzatto, M.J. (2000) “Note inedite di Giovanni Tzetzes e restauro di antichi codici alla fine del XIII secolo: il problema del Laur. 70, 3 di Erodoto,” in Prato (2000) 633–654.
- Magdalino, P. (1993) *The Empire of Manuel I. Komnenos, 1143–1180*. Cambridge.
- Magnelli, E. (2008) “Colluthus’ ‘Homeric’ Epyllion,” *Ramus* 37: 151–172.
- Masson, O. (ed.) (1962) *Les fragments du poète Hipponax*. Paris.
- Matranga, P. (1850) *Anecdota Graeca e mss. bibliothecis Vaticana, Angelica, Barberiniana, Vallicelliana, Medicea, Vindobonensi* 1–11. Romae.

- Mazzucchi, C.M. (2004) "Ambrosianus C 222 inf. (*Graecus* 886): il codice e il suo autore. Parte seconda: l'autore," *Aevum* 78: 411–440.
- Mertens, P. (1960) "Songe d'Hécube, pomme de discorde et autres «Antehomerica»," *AC*: 18–29.
- Montanari, F., Matthaios, S., and Rengakos, A. (eds.) (2015) *Brill's Companion to Ancient Greek Scholarship I. History. Disciplinary Profiles*. Leiden—Boston.
- Montanari, F., and Pittaluga, S. (eds.) (1997) *Posthomeric I. Tradizioni omeriche dall'Antichità al Rinascimento*. Genova.
- Morel, F. (1616) *Iliacum carmen epici poetae Graeci, cuius nomen ignoratur, ingenium proditur hoc eleganti Fragmento*. Parisiis.
- Morgan, G. (1983) "Homer in Byzantium: John Tzetzes," in Rubino and Shelmerdine (1983) 165–188.
- Nünlist, R. (2009) *The Ancient Critic at Work. Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia*. Cambridge.
- Nünlist, R. (2012) "Homer as blueprint for speechwriters: Eustathius' commentaries and rhetoric," *GRBS* 52: 493–509.
- Odorico, P., Agapitos, P.A., and Hinterberger, M. (eds.) (2009) «Doux remède ...» *Poésie et poétique à Byzance*, Actes du IV^e colloque international philologique «ΕΡΜΗΝΕΙΑ» (Paris, 23–25 février 2006). Paris.
- Papathomopoulos, M. (2007) 'Εξήγησις Ἰωάννου γραμματικοῦ τοῦ Τζέτζου εἰς τὴν Ὀμήρου Ἰλιάδα. Athenai.
- Pardini, A. (1993) "Per una nuova edizione dei lirici," *QUCC* 43: 111–131.
- Paschalis, M. (2008) "The Abduction of Helen: A Reappraisal," *Ramus* 37: 136–150.
- Patzig, E. (1901) "Malalas und Tzetzes," *ByzZ* 10: 385–393.
- Petit, R.P.L. (1900) "Le Monastère de Notre-Dame de Pitié en Macédoine," *IRAIK* 6: 1–153.
- Pontani, F. (2000) "Il proemio al *Commento all'Odissea* di Eustazio di Tessalonica (con appunti sulla tradizione del testo)," *BollClass* 21: 5–58.
- Pontani, F. (2005a) *Sguardi su Ulisse. La tradizione esegetica greca all'Odissea*. Roma.
- Pontani, F. (2005b) "Il mito, la lingua, la morale: tre piccole introduzioni a Omero," *RFIC* 133: 23–74.
- Pontani, F. (2006) "The First Byzantine Commentary on the *Iliad*: Isaac Porphyrogenitus and his Scholia," *ByzZ* 99: 551–596.
- Pontani, F. (2009) "Achille, occhio degli Achei (Antehomerica Uffenbachiana)," *RHT* 4: 1–29.
- Pontani, F. (2015) "Scholarship in the Byzantine Empire (529–1453)," in Montanari, Matthaios, and Rengakos (2015) 297–455.
- Prato, G. (ed.) (2000) *I manoscritti greci*, Atti del v Colloquio Internazionale di Paleografia greca (Cremona, 4–10 ottobre 1998). Firenze.

- Rhoby, A. (2006) "Verschiedene Bemerkungen zur Sebastokratorissa Eirene und zu Autoren in ihrem Umfeld," *Nea Rhome* 6: 305–336.
- Rhoby, A. (2010) "Ioannes Tzetzes als Auftragsdichter," *GLB* 15: 155–170.
- Roberto, U. (2005) *Ioannis Antiocheni Fragmenta ex Historia chronica*. Berlin—New York.
- Rubino, C.A., and Shelmerdine, C.W. (eds.) (1983) *Approaches to Homer*. Austin.
- Scheer, E. (1908) *Lycophronis Alexandra* 11. *Scholia*. Berolini.
- Schirach, G.B. (1770) τοῦ Τζέτζου τὰ πρὸς Ὀμήρου, τὰ Ὀμήρου, καὶ τὰ μέθ' Ὀμηρον ἐν συντόμῳ ἐκδοθέντα, *Ioannis Tetzze Carmina Iliaca*. Halae.
- Schrader, H. (1888) "Eine studie über die daktylischen verse des Theodoros Prodrornos und des Johannes Tzetzes," *Jahrbücher für classische Philologie* 34: 601–609.
- Shepard, J. (1979) "Tzetzes' Letters to Leo at Dristra," *ByzF* 6: 191–239.
- Spanoudakis, K. (ed.) (2014) *Nonnus of Panopolis in Context. Poetry and Cultural Milieu in Late Antiquity with a Section on Nonnus and the Modern World*. Berlin—Boston.
- Spingou, F. (2011) "A Poem on the Refortification of Dorylaion in 1175," *Byzantina Symmeikta* 21: 137–168.
- Thomas, J., and Constantinides Hero, A. (eds.) (2000) *Byzantine Monastic Foundation Documents: A Complete Translation of the Surviving Founders' Typica and Testaments*. Washington, D.C.
- Tychsen, T.C. (1788) "Ioannis Tetzze Carminum Iliacorum initium e cod. Vindobonensi nunc primum editum," in Id., and Heeren (1788) 3–23.
- Tychsen, T.C., and Heeren, A.H.L. (eds.) (1788), *Bibliothek der alten Litteratur und Kunst* iv. Göttingen.
- Vian, F. (1963) *Quintus de Smyrne. La suite d'Homère* 1, *Livres 1–4*. Paris.
- Wendel, C. (1948) "Tzetzes 1," in *RE* VII A.2 (1948) 1959–2010.
- Williams, F. (1978) *Callimachus Hymn to Apollo. A Commentary*. Oxford.
- Wilson, N.G. (1996²) *Scholars of Byzantium*. London—Cambridge, MA.

Joseph of Exeter: Troy through Dictys and Dares

Francine Mora-Lebrun

When Joseph of Exeter begins to write his *Ylias* around the year 1183, the matter of Troy had been reappearing in the medieval literature for about a century.¹ Towards the end of the eleventh century, Godfrey of Reims and Baudri of Bourgueil composed metric poems which represent either an exchange of letters between Helen and Paris like in the *Heroides* (Baudri); or the abduction of Helen and the fall of Troy, two motifs embroidered upon the mantle of Calliope, the muse of epic poetry (Godfrey).² Several Latin anonymous poems that were written somewhat later, in the early twelfth century, take the form of lyric complaints, *planctus* about the fall of Troy. The most famous of them is the *Pergama flere volo*, which had many imitators, for example Peter of Saintes, the teacher of the future Henry II Plantagenêt, king of England.³ However, the common ground of these first poems about Troy is their inspiration by Virgil, Ovid or the *Ilias latina*, the Latin adaptation of Homer. They are poetical games through which medieval clerics hoped to compete with the *auctores*, the great poets of Latin antiquity.

Things change towards the middle of the twelfth century. At that time the manuscripts of Dares' *De excidio Troiae*, a short text in Latin prose that claims to be the translation of a Greek text written by an old fighter of the Trojan War, Dares of Phrygia, begin to multiply in the North of France and in England. This text was not unknown to the Carolingian scholars, but its diffusion became much larger.⁴ Two Latin poems composed around 1155 bear testimony to this success: the *Ylias* of Simon Aurea Capra and the anonymous *Historia Troyana Daretis Frigii*, a short poem in hexameters, which in its first verses tells of its intention to replace "poetical fictions" (*figmenta poetica*) which "perturb Troy's history" (*historiam Troie turbant*), following the "faithful traces" (*vestigia fida*) that he finds in Dares.⁵ In Simon's *Ylias*, the influence of Dares appears only in the second version, the longer one, which was probably written when

1 For these reappearances, see Tilliette (1999).

2 Kretschmer (2011) and (2013).

3 Boutemy (1946).

4 Faivre d'Arcier (2006) 341. He inventories 24 manuscripts copied between 1100 and 1200.

5 Stohlmann (1968) 267: *Historiam Troie figmenta poetica turbant. / [...] Mens tamen incaluit vestigia fida sequendo / Daretis Frigii Troyanum scribere bellum* (*Historia Troyana*, v. 1–5).

Simon was a canon at Saint-Victor in Paris.⁶ This version is associated with the anonymous *Historia Troyana* in the only extant manuscript containing it (the BnF Latin 8430).

However the first text that established definitively Dares' authority is a vernacular one, the *Roman de Troie* by Benoît of Sainte-Maure, a long romance of some thirty thousand octosyllabic verses written in old French around 1165, probably in the court of Henry II Plantagenêt.⁷ In his prologue Benoît praises Dares' veracity against the lies of Homer whom he admires nevertheless, since he names him a "clers merveillos" ("a wonderful clerk"). But the merit of Dares is to avoid telling improbable fictions like Homer, who represented gods fighting men, and so to respect the true story: "de l'estoire le veir escrist" ("he wrote the truth of history").⁸ Benoît also mentions Dictys ("Ditis", v. 649), which is something new. Dictys is almost the twin of Dares, since his *Ephemeris belli Troiani* claims to be the translation of a Greek text written by an old fighter of the Trojan War, but in the Greek army, as shown by his name: *Dictys Cretensis*, Dictys of Crete. However its diffusion was much less widespread than that of Dares.⁹ So Benoît uses him only to tell of the return of the Greek warriors to their country. The *Roman de Troie* was very famous until the end of the Middle Ages, as is shown by the number of its manuscripts and of the works that used it.¹⁰ Joseph of Exeter's *Ylias*, composed some twenty years after it, perhaps depends also upon it.

It is difficult to say whether Joseph of Exeter knew his predecessors, for he does not mention any of them and his life is not well known. But it is even more difficult to believe that he had never heard of Benoît's romance, for two reasons. First, because he wrote his *Ylias* for an episcopal court, the court of Canterbury, which was very close to the court of the Plantagenêt. Second, because we find in his epic poem some allusions which prove his interest in the members of this royal court and the stories that circulated there: a comparison between the death of Hector and that of Henry III the Young King, the son of

6 Boutemy (1946–1947). Unpublished researches of Martha Parrott (1976) and Sébastien Peyrard (2007) have shown that there are only two versions of the *Ylias* and not three, as thought by André Boutemy. The first version, shorter, was likely written for Henry the Liberal, Count of Champagne.

7 There is not clear dedication, but now critics mostly think that Benoît wrote also the *Chronique des ducs de Normandie*, clearly dedicated to Henry II.

8 Constans (1904–1912) t. 1, v. 45 and v. 116. Dares also is named a "clerc merveillos" (v. 99).

9 Faivre d'Arcier (2006) 361. He inventories only 8 manuscripts before 1300.

10 Jung (1996).

Henry II, a joke about the Breton people who wait for the return of Arthur.¹¹ So it is possible to see in Joseph's *Ylias* a polemical answer to the success of the *Roman de Troie*: there had been tensions between Plantagenêt's dynasty and the court of Canterbury since the murder of Thomas Becket, who is recalled in Joseph's dedication to his uncle Baldwin, Archbishop of Canterbury and second successor of Thomas.¹² It is also possible that Joseph heard of Simon Aurea Capra who had worked around 1150 for Henry the Liberal, Count of Champagne, for he stayed in Reims towards the years 1188–1190, at the time when he probably finished his *Ylias*.¹³ What is sure is that Joseph, like Benoît and the anonymous author of the *Historia Troyana*, founds his epic poem on the historical authority of Dares by setting it against the fictions of Virgil and Homer:

Meoniumne senem mirer Latiumque Maronem
An vatem Frigium, Martem cui certior index
Explicuit presens oculus, quem fabula nescit?
[...] Mens conscia veri
Proscripsit longe ludentem ficta poetam.

Should I admire old Homer, Latin Virgil, or / The Bard of Troy (unknown to tale), whose present eye, / A surer witness of the truth, disclosed the war? / [...] My mind, aware of truth, / Has banished far the teasing poet and his tales.¹⁴

JOSEPH, *Ylias*, 1, 23–29

Even if we may perceive some irony in the periphrasis *vatem Frigium*, for the succinct and bald prose of Dares is absolutely not the language of an inspired poet, Joseph's choice proves that in the late twelfth century the *De excidio Troiae* had become an authority of the highest importance in the treatment of the matter of Troy.¹⁵ This is a matter that it is necessary to treat henceforth with a historical, not literary, approach, even if it is not forbidden to compete with

11 Joseph puts these two allusions at the end of Book 3 and at the end of Book 5, in strategic places.

12 Mora (2003). Kelly (1999), however, who thinks that Joseph did not know Benoît, studies the two works in parallel (pp. 121–170).

13 About Joseph's biography, see Mora and Tilliette (2003) 12–19.

14 Gompf (1970) and Rigg (2005).

15 About the growing historical authority of the *De excidio Troiae* during the twelfth century, see Jung (1997).

the *auctores*: the form of Joseph's epic, written in hexameters and divided in six books, is very classical. However, Joseph wants to be a modern poet, who follows the trends of his time and so wants to give vent to the "holy, sacred Truth" (*veri sacra fides*), "to exile sent by ancient poets' din [...] so long".¹⁶ In the disclosure of this truth, Dictys is only second: like Benoît, Joseph uses him for the return of the Greek warriors, but he does not mention him.

The replacement of Homer and Virgil by Dares had important consequences for Joseph's epic. So we must look at Dares' and Dictys' texts in order to understand what were their intentions and to try to explain the reasons for their success. Since the pioneering study of Nathaniel E. Griffin, our knowledge has much progressed, mostly in the last decades.¹⁷

1 Dictys and Dares: From Poetical Game to History

Obviously Dares' and Dictys' texts are deceits, but it is not certain that this was the intention of their authors from the beginning. The *De excidio Troiae* and the *Ephemeris belli Troiani* both claim to be translations of Greek texts. Scholars thought that they lied until fragments of the text translated by the *Ephemeris* were found on a papyrus in 1900. So for the *Ephemeris*, the existence of a Greek original is proved. It is now dated from about the late second century.¹⁸ For the *De excidio Troiae* doubt remains, but the example of the *Ephemeris* permits one to think that the existence of a Greek original is not impossible; besides, Aelian, a Greek writer of the late second century, mentions Dares as the author of an *Ilias* older than Homer's.¹⁹ The first and second centuries were times of discussion and contestation of the Homeric tradition. Dion of Pruse's *Trojan Discourse* undermines Homer's authority by portraying him as a liar, Lucian's *True Stories* suggest that this authority is mostly fictional, and Philostratus' *Heroikos*, in a parodic way, gives to Homer a contradictor in the ghost of Prote-silaus, the first victim of the war.²⁰ These works continue the debate started by

16 Joseph, *Ylias*, 1, 6–7: *Utquid ab antiquo vatū proscripta tumultu, / Veri sacra fides, longum silvescis in evum?*

17 Griffin (1907).

18 The prologue that probably preceded the Greek text and that now follows the letter written by Lucius Septimius, the Latin translator, even pretends that before the Greek text there was an older text written in Phoenician, of which the Greek text is only the translation. But there any original was not found ...

19 *Various History*, 11, 2. See Beschorner (1992) 231–243.

20 Kim (2010). See also Beschorner (1992) 250–254 and Usener (1994).

Herodotus about the veracity of Homer, poet and historian, for learned readers who desired both to renovate Homeric tradition and reflect upon it. They are intellectual and poetical games which must enable their authors to show their critical minds and to compete with Homer, sometimes with a parodic intention. It is probably in this cultural context that the Greek original of the *Ephemeris* and perhaps also that of the *De excidio Troiae*, assuming it existed, were composed.²¹ It is obviously impossible to say which of the two texts preceded the other.

The situation of the two Latin translations is quite different. The *Ephemeris* was probably translated in the early fourth century, the *De excidio Troiae* in the fifth century. At that time the readers of the western part of the Roman empire, much less learned and generally unable to read Greek texts, wanted above all historical works written in Latin, preferably in the form of summaries. It was the time of Ammianus Marcellinus and of the *Historia Augusta*. So the *Ephemeris* and the *De excidio Troiae* fit perfectly since they include both the whole war of Troy until the fall of the city and the return of the Greek warriors; the first from the abduction of Helen, the second from the expedition of Jason, which caused the first destruction of Troy.²² They fit better than the *Ilias latina*, which was discovered again at that time but is more limited, like Homer's *Iliad* from which it was adapted, since it begins with Achilles' wrath and ends with Hector's death and funeral. Furthermore, they are rather short, especially the *De excidio Troiae*, so short that several scholars thought (but without sufficient evidence) that it was the summary of an older Greek or Latin *Dares uberior*.²³ Finally, they seem to offer the best guarantees for historical veracity since they claim to be the diaries of two eye-witnesses, old fighters of the war of Troy. The titles given to the two works are significant: *ephemeris* and *annales* for Dictys, *acta diurna* for Dares.²⁴ Only the title *historia* is an exception; it is given by many manuscripts to Dares' text, probably in order to present it as a more ambitious enterprise.

21 Cf. Beschorner (1992) 249: "Wir haben es also bei den Acta [Dares' text] offensichtlich mit einem intellektuellen Spiel zu tun, das teilweise fast parodistische Züge trägt".

22 Beschorner (1992) 258–263: "Die lateinischen Acta, seien sie nun übersetzt oder als lateinisches Original verfasst worden, fügen sich also auch in die historiographische Tradition des 4. und 5. Jh.n.Chr. ein" (p. 262). See also Gianotti (1979).

23 Schetter (1987) and (1988); Bradley (1991). Other critics as Lumiansky (1969) tried to show that the extant Dares' text was not so clumsy.

24 *Ephemeris* appears in Septimius' letter, *annales* in the prologue that follows it. Dares gives the name *acta diurna* to his work in his conclusion—possible translation of *ephemeris*. See interesting introductions and commentaries of Frazer (1966) and Fry (1998).

So two texts which were probably in the beginning intellectual and poetical games gradually became historical authorities. Isidore of Seville says that Dares is the oldest of the pagan historians, probably blending him with Dictys, since he speaks of a text written on palm leaves.²⁵ It is now easy to laugh at the ingenuousness of these medieval people who believed the allegations of two forgers, but we must confess that everything was set to deceive the readers. Even the names of the two authors were well chosen: the *Ilias latina* mentions Dares' two sons among the Trojan fighters;²⁶ Dictys is not mentioned, but he claims to be in the service of the Cretan king Idomeneus and of his companion Merion, whom the *Ilias latina* mentions on several occasions.²⁷ They both assert that they tell the truth and nothing but the truth, and their translators insist on this point: Dares' translator, who claims to be the Latin historian Cornelius Nepos, explicitly opposes the veracity of the text that he translates to Homer's lies.²⁸ In fact, Dictys skilfully puts together events told by the *Iliad* and events borrowed from other traditions. He keeps Achilles' wrath roused by Briseis' abduction but adds another episode: Achilles' love for Polyxena, one of Priam's daughters, which Hyginus knew before him.²⁹ Dares differs more from Homer, for in his text Achilles' wrath disappears so that Briseis, who is nevertheless described, is not developed further. The common ground of these innovations is to transform Homeric heroes into ordinary men, which seem more likely and hence more true. In Dictys' and Dares' texts Achilles dies a victim of his impossible love in an ambush hatched by Paris, and in Dictys' text Hector also dies in an ambush where he does not have any time for fighting. Dares even transforms the famous Trojan horse into a sculpture of a horse's head at the Scaean gate of Troy. This horse is no longer useful because the fall of the city, like in Dictys' text, is explained by the treason of Aeneas and his accomplice Antenor, who open the gates and give access to Greek warriors. So Homer's epic is replaced by realistic, more credible novels.³⁰

One thing was especially important in a time when Christian readers were becoming more and more numerous: the partial or total elimination of pagan gods. In the *Ilias latina*, as in Homer's *Iliad*, gods fight men and are sometimes

25 *Etymologiae*, I, 42: *Apud gentiles vero primus Dares Phrygius de Graecis et Troianis historiam edidit, quam in foliis palmarum ab eo conscriptam esse ferunt* (ed. Lindsay, Oxford, 1911).

26 *Ilias latina*, v. 405.

27 *Ilias latina*, v. 208, 429, 432, 579, 774, 1009, 1014.

28 In an introductory letter supposedly addressed to Sallustius Crispus (Sallust), another great Latin historian.

29 Hyginus, *Fabulae*, 110.

30 Merkle (1996) and (1999).

wounded by them.³¹ In the *Ephemeris* such fights never appear. Dictys is reluctant to remove gods completely, particularly in well-known episodes where they must traditionally intervene, but he always adds to the hypothesis of a divine intervention a more rationalist explanation, which he clearly prefers.³² Dares again is more innovative, for in his text the action of gods practically disappear; only some temples and oracles remain.³³ The Judgment of Paris, with its three goddesses, is not removed, but it appears within a dream.³⁴ Furthermore the Latin translator, referring in his introductory letter to a so-called judgment of the Athenian people, calls Homer a madman (*insanus*) because he describes men fighting gods; as we saw, Benoît of Sainte-Maure translated this passage. We have here one possible reason why in the Middle Ages Dares was more successful than Dictys. There are others. As a Greek warrior, Dictys is resolutely opposed to the Trojan people, whom he constantly calls “barbarian” and of whom he emphasizes the disorder and cruelty. It is not impossible that there was a political intention in the beginning, but this partiality is very far from the objectivity desirable in a historian.³⁵ Dares is much more neutral. He tells the events as they happened, without comment, so that he is more credible. Stylistic choices were important also. The *Ephemeris* and the *De excidio Troiae* are both written in an austere language that imitates Sallust’s style, greatly appreciated in the fourth and fifth centuries, but Dares’ language is particularly poor and his style very bald, which may appear as an additional guarantee of veracity, since he refuses rhetorical lies. This artless language was also easier to understand for those who did not know Latin very well, in late Antiquity and in the Middle Ages.

Through Dictys’ and Dares’ texts the Trojan matter is deeply transformed. It is no longer a heroic story where gods intervene, it is a prosaic account where there are only human deeds and passions. Joseph of Exeter used this account, which everybody believed to be true, not only to compete with Homer and Virgil, but also to teach the powerful lords of his time.

31 So Venus, who tried to protect her son Aeneas, is wounded by Diomedes (*Ilias latina*, v. 464–472).

32 See, for example, the episodes of Diana’s wrath in Aulis, and Apollo’s outrage at the treatment of his priest, Chryses (*Ephemeris*, 1, 19 and 2, 30).

33 Diana and Apollo’s temple where Helen is abducted, Apollo’s oracle in Delphi which is consulted by Achilles and Calchas (*De excidio Troiae*, 10 and 15).

34 *De excidio Troiae*, 7.

35 The Greek writer Dictys would like to discredit Trojan warriors in order to attack the Roman people, who is sprung from them. See Callu (1978) and Diop (2009).

2 Joseph of Exeter's *Ylias*: Historical Truth Used by a Moral Epic

Like his predecessors, Joseph of Exeter wants to compete with the *auctores*. He says it very clearly in the first verses of his epic claiming a place among modern poets:

Si nostris nil dulce novum, nil utile visum,
Quod teneri pariunt anni, si secula tantum
Aurea Saturni memorant et nulla recentis
Gracia virtutis, aude tamen ardua, pubes!

If modern taste thinks nothing sweet or of avail / That recent times
produce, if Saturn's golden age / Alone is in our mind, and if no favor's
shown / To modern worth—yet dare to the try the heights, young Truth!

JOSEPH, *Ylias*, 1, 15–18

But at the same time he wants to respect historical truth, and so limit as much as possible his own inventions. He emphasizes it in the last verses:

Hactenus Yliace questus lamenta ruine
Confusa explicui veteris compendia veri,
Etsi quando auctor, rarus tamen.

Till now I've mourned the tragic fall of Ilium, / Unfolding brief and tangled
webs of ancient truth, / And adding only here and there.

JOSEPH, *Ylias*, 6, 960–961

So the first task that he gives himself is to use his poetical faculty in favour of this truth, so that its form may be worthy of it:

Mecum, inclita, mecum
Exorere et vultum ruga leviores resumens
Plebeam dignare tubam sterilisque vetustas
Erubeat, dum culta venis, dum libera frontem
Exeris!

Come, famous Truth, / With me: arise, smooth out the wrinkles, show your
face, / Exalt my humble trumpet. Dry antiquity should blush / When you
come forth adorned and freely show your face.

JOSEPH, *Ylias*, 1, 9–13

Joseph's poetical aim is analogous to Benoît of Sainte-Maure's, who also wants to "follow the matter" inherited from Dares and Dictys, but intends to add here and there "some good tale" of his own to embellish it.³⁶

Joseph's allusion to his "humble trumpet" (*plebeam tubam*) belongs to the *topos* of affected modesty. In fact, the first thing that the reader of his epic notes is the abundance of stylistic daintinesses and rhetorical ornaments.³⁷ The vocabulary is over-elaborate, with unusual words, sometimes neologisms, and very often metonymies: Achilles is named *Eacides* from the name of his grand-father, Helen *Lacena* or *Tindaris* from her birthplace or her father's name. We also note many alliterations and the frequent use of paronomasia; thus the name of Venus is associated with the corrupting (*venale*) power of love.³⁸ Metaphors multiply and are often difficult to understand because they require mythological knowledge; thus *Cirrea juventa* is a young laurel because the laurel and Cirrha, one of the two tops of the mount Parnassus, are both consecrated to Apollo.³⁹ Lastly the "Golden lines" (*versi aurei*), which put symmetrically two nouns and two adjectives around a verb, are frequently used. These methods constantly repeated produce a very brilliant style inspired by Ovid, Lucan, Statius and Claudian, with a nearly baroque exuberance. Quoting W.B. Sedgwick, who writes that "Joseph's great defect is that he can hardly think of a noun without an adjective," J.Y. Tilliette speaks of "too many ornaments of which the reader gets tired".⁴⁰ It happened rather frequently in the twelfth century, where the abundance of rhetorical ornaments was a sign of modernity, but in Joseph's *Ylias* these ornaments are very numerous.

This over-elaborate style appears with particular profusion in digressions added by Joseph to his Trojan matter. In fact, although he claims to have rarely been an *auctor* in the etymological sense of the word (from Latin verb *augere*, "to augment") and thus to have added little to the framework inherited from Dares and Dictys, Joseph took from his own framework several brilliant inventions. The famous Judgment of Paris is removed by Dictys, but preserved by Dares inside a dream. Joseph develops it in a very remarkable manner. Each goddess speaks in her own favour with a long speech where she tries both

36 Constans (1904–1912) t. I, v. 142–144: "Ne di mie qu' aucun bon dit / N'i mete, se faire le sai, / Mais la matire en ensivrai" ("I don't say that I will never add some good tale, if I can do it, but I will follow the matter [inherited]").

37 As listed by Sedgwick (1930); Mora and Tilliette (2003), 26–31.

38 Joseph, *Ylias*, 2, 420: *Exicium venale Venus* ("Venus, venal death").

39 Joseph, *Ylias*, 2, 218.

40 Sedgwick (1930) 64; Mora and Tilliette (2003) 30: "une surcharge ornementale qui finit par lasser le lecteur".

to valorize herself and to defame her two rivals using all possible rhetorical resources. It is an amusing and subtle game where paganism becomes its own judge, and a very developed one too, as it extends over half of Book 2. Other speeches are also amplified, for example Hecuba's *planctus* after the fall of the city, which is reminiscent of the *Pergama flere volo*.⁴¹ Another type of digression is descriptive amplification, especially the description of tombs, which appears three times in Benoît's *Roman de Troie*: the tombs of Hector, Achilles and Paris. Perhaps because he wants to compete with his predecessor, Joseph describes lengthily the tomb of Teuthras, the king of Mysia, killed by Achilles in the beginning of the war. Made with precious materials, this tomb is, like Benoît's tombs, wonderfully rich; furthermore it is covered with marvellous sculptures representing the stages of the king's life, giving the illusion that he is still alive.⁴²

These digressions have sometimes puzzled modern scholars because they seem to break off the narration of the facts without sufficient reason.⁴³ They may explain the very harsh criticism of Alan of Lille, in a well-known passage of the *Anticlaudianus* where he attacks Joseph under the pseudonym of Ennius: *Illic pannoso plebescit carmine noster / Ennius et Priami fortunas intonat*.⁴⁴ The adjective *pannosus*, "tattered", is not chosen by accident. It evokes two authorities: first Horace's *Ars poetica* and its attacks against the poets who tack on *panni purpurei*, brilliant pieces not well integrated into the narrative context; then Saint Augustine, who opposes the rags of human imperfection to divine perfection. So Alan means, on the one hand, that Joseph is incapable of organizing correctly his material because of his too many digressions, and on the other, that this matter is devoid of interest because it tells of only human adventures that depend on chance, without any transcendent meaning. This explains the use of the word *fortunas*, which evokes the hazards of the Wheel of Fortune.⁴⁵ Is this harsh judgment justified? As a philosophical epic, the *Anticlaudianus* is certainly more ambitious than Joseph's epic, which is a

41 Mora (2006).

42 Mora (2000); Mora and Tilliette (2003) 25; J.Y. Tilliette thinks that Joseph wanted to compete here with Darius' and Stateira's tombs described by Walter of Chatillon in the *Alexandreis*. See also Ratkowitsch (1991) 318–352.

43 See for example Sedgwick (1930) 59–60: "the conduct of the story was the last thing he troubled about; in fact he seems, like Lucan, mainly concerned to get away from the story and concentrate on speeches, descriptions, rhetorical outbursts and moral and theological disquisitions".

44 Bossuat (1955) 1, 165–166: "Our Ennius degrades himself with a tattered poem and resounds Priam's fortuitous adventures".

45 See the convincing demonstration of Rouillé (2010).

poetical work about Dares' historical account—a *Dares metricus*, as in the title given by the manuscripts. But thanks to the model of Lucan, which was very important at that time, the historical epic is not only a stylistic game; this epic also wants to incite reflection. So we must associate Joseph's *Ylias* with Walter of Chatillon's *Alexandreis*, another historical epic of this time, also harshly criticized by Alan.⁴⁶

In the twelfth century Lucan was mostly considered a historian, and even a philosopher who taught the contempt of the world, as his epic, which describes a world disturbed by discord and punctuated by the fall of mighty men, oscillates between satire and tragedy.⁴⁷ Walter of Chatillon was inspired by him in the *Alexandreis*, as pointed out by Everardus Alemannus, who writes in the *Laborintus* that in Walter's epic "Alexander shines with Lucan's light".⁴⁸ But Joseph was also influenced by him, together with Statius' *Thebaid*, another one of his great models, as shown by these four programmatic verses placed into the narrative of Troy's fall:

Nox fera, nox vere nox noxia, turbida, tristis,
Insidiosa, ferox, tragicis ululanda conturnis
Aut satira rodenda gravi, tu sola triumphas
Tantium nisus steriles lucrata dierum!

O cruel night (so truly named), confused and grim, / Night, fierce, treacherous, a theme for tragic style / Or satire's biting pen, for you alone can boast / A profit from so many days of futile strife!

JOSEPH, *Ylias*, 6, 760–763

Oscillating like Lucan's epic between satire and tragedy, Joseph's epic does not spur one to admire warlike heroism; on the contrary, it reproves the false values of this deceptive heroism that leads men to their ruin. This is the reason why it begins with a lament, a *planctus* of which the *incipit* is Juvenal's formula:

Yliadum lacrimas concessaque Pergama fatis,
Prelia bina ducum, bis adactam cladibus urbem
In cineres querimur.⁴⁹

46 In the verses that follow immediately those quoted *supra* (*Anticlaudianus*, 1, 167–170).

47 Von Moos (2005) 89–204 ("Lucan in the Middle Ages"), especially p. 131.

48 *Laborintus*, v. 637: *Lucet Alexander Lucani luce*.

49 *Yliadum lacrimas*: Juvenal, *Saturae*, 10, 261.

The tears of Trojan women, Troy resigned to fate, / The leaders' twice-fought war, the city twice reduced / To dust, I mourn and weep.

JOSEPH, *Ylias*, 1, 1–3

This formula sets the tone, as many passages inspired by Juvenal appear throughout Joseph's epic. Satire 10 especially, in which the two main themes are the dangers of false goods (among which there is warlike heroism) and the inconstancy of Fortune, is used at length. J. Roger Dunkle even writes that "Joseph is a satirist masquerading as an epic poet".⁵⁰ Thus, we find in the *Ylias* the motif of "laughter mixed with tears" (*flente cachinno*, *Ylias*, 4, 222) that is typical of Juvenal as a biting polemist.

So Joseph does not avoid the descriptions of fights, but he does not multiply them and he never praises warlike heroism. Even if he blames Paris in particular, whom he calls a *predo* ("despoiler", *Ylias*, 3, 285) because of Helen's abduction and whom he sends to hell after his death, he does not like the Greek warriors more than the Trojans.⁵¹ He remains neutral, like Dares. All fighters die because they fall prey to their own passions, to their wrath or to their pride. The hideousness of fights is emphasized by rhetorical games and described with many details:

Gaudia Martis

Horrida deliciosque truces effervere passim

Aspiceres. Fluit huic in vultus pulchra genarum

Rapta dies, mento hic linguaque et nare recisa

Informes aperit rictus.

Now could be seen the dire / Delights of Mars, his cruel sport abroad throughout / The land. One's beautiful cheeks's light, ripped out, spreads on / His face; another's chin and tongue and nose are slashed / And show a gaping grin.

JOSEPH, *Ylias*, 5, 368–372

The Trojan War becomes a tale full of sound and fury, signifying nothing. Joseph takes pity only on women, whom he considers as the first victims of the fighting. This explains some of his choices. He develops at length the description of the sorrow of Hesione, Priam's sister, married against her will

50 Dunkle (1987) 213. See also Maas (1899).

51 About Paris in Joseph's *Ylias*, see Mora (2008).

to the Greek Telamon: during the wedding banquet, *tacito perfundit pocula luctu / et lacrimas bibit ipsa suas* ("she pours her silent grief into her cup / and drinks her own sad tears," *Ylias*, 2, 153–154). He develops also the famous dream of Andromache in an inventive manner. Not only does this dream foretell Hector's death, but Andromache sees herself being soiled by gory mouths: *nudos rursus videt oris hiatus / sanguineos fedare sinus* ("again she sees mouths gape wide and stain / her naked breast with blood," Joseph, *Ylias*, 5, 437–438).⁵²

This critical and disillusioned image of the Trojan War fits in with the two versions of Dares and Dictys, which lower and degrade Homeric heroes. As we saw, Dictys constantly blames the Trojan "barbarians," and progressively the Greek warriors seem contaminated by them, in particular by becoming as cruel as them.⁵³ As for Dares, Willy Schetter proposed viewing the organization of his account as the progress of a tragedy leading the blinded Trojan people to their loss.⁵⁴ Thus, for Joseph, Dares and Dictys narrate the true story of Troy because this story tells the truth of human nature, governed by passions, devoted to false goods, and finally responsible for its own bad luck. Alan of Lille is right on that score: the *Ylias* offers a Boethian image of the Trojan war, dominated by the Wheel of Fortune, as shown by Douglas Kelly.⁵⁵ But in this context, all digressions become significant and participate in the whole demonstration. So Joseph's epic is not so "tattered", not so disjointed.⁵⁶ Hecuba's *planctus* echoes Joseph's lamentation. The contentions of the three goddesses of Paris's Judgment prove the ridiculous nature of false gods. Teuthras' tomb, placed in the beginning of the fights, is the first image of the war's horror, as it seems to be dripping with blood.⁵⁷ Another remarkable description, Helen's picture, which shows her beautiful outside, but hideous inside because of her sensuality, is clearly opposite to the idealization of Benoît's *Roman de Troie*, where Helen and Paris are the model of a courteous couple.⁵⁸ Joseph is inspired sometimes by Dares, sometimes by Dictys, depending on his aim. For example, he borrows

52 Mora (2007) 107–111. Rigg (2005) proposes another translation: he thinks that Joseph speaks of Hector's mouth and breast.

53 Merkle (1996) 567–571.

54 Schetter (1988).

55 Kelly (1999) 131–144.

56 Kelly (1999) 123: "one feature of Joseph's art deserves special attention here: the purpose of the descriptions he does amplify".

57 Joseph, *Ylias*, 4, 486–487: *Cruor altus in auras / Exilit et minio rorant tabulata fluenti* ("His noble blood spurts out / Into the air. The floorboards dripped with flowing red").

58 Tilliette (1993).

from Dictys the *fabula* of Hecuba's dream where Paris appears as a burning torch that must set fire to Troy. This metaphor is repeated three times in Book 3, which narrates the abduction of Helen.⁵⁹

For what kind of readers did Joseph write his epic? Certainly for the Archbishop of Canterbury and for other cultured clerics like him, but maybe not only them. The treatment of pagan gods may help us to better understand his intentions. As we saw, these gods are not completely removed, but they are mostly used for rhetorical games. Many of them are metonymies: they symbolize natural powers or human passions. Thetis and her fellow Triton, who are looking for Achilles' body in the sea after the battle, personify the waves of the sea washing over the bodies of dead fighters.⁶⁰ Venus, who supervises the abduction of Helen, embodies the sexual desire that impels Paris.⁶¹ But sometimes the pagan gods mingle with the Christian God, so that the passage where they appear becomes a theological digression. It happens in a complaint of Joseph to Jupiter in the beginning of Book 2, when Allecto spurs Priam to start the war:

O hominum superumque pater! Si numina curas,
Cur hominem plectis? Miserene quod incola terre,
Despicitur? Certe lacrimis noctique dedisti
Proscriptas a luce animas.

O father of both man and gods, if gods are yours, / Why torment men? Is man despised, since he just lives / On wretched earth? To night and tears, for sure, you sent / Souls driven out from light.

JOSEPH, *Ylias*, 2, 15–18

These verses “seem to allude to the story of the Fall and human exile from paradise. [So] [...] Jupiter is identified with the God of Genesis, and it is to this supreme divinity that Joseph laments”.⁶² We have here almost a sermon addressed by a clergyman to laymen. “Souls driven out from light” are the pagan kings and warriors, devoid of the divine light. Their blindness will lead them to their destruction, and medieval knights are incited not to follow their example. “If all this is true, Joseph's procedure could be seen as parallel to that of Walter

59 Joseph, *Ylias*, 3, 155–159, 284–289 and 378–380. Cf. Dictys, *Ephemeris*, 3, 26.

60 Joseph, *Ylias*, 5, 381–384. See Parker (1995).

61 Joseph, *Ylias*, 3, 274–284. See also Gianola (1998).

62 Rigg (2001) 27. This very complete study about gods concludes with this passage by showing its interest.

of Chatillon, who, according to Maura Lafferty's careful analysis, presented Alexander as a hero flawed mainly by living without the benefit of Christianity and divine Grace".⁶³ A digression sustains that hypothesis: Troy's description at the end of Book 1. Under the deceptive appearance of a *locus amoenus*, Priam's city, remarkable for the height of its monuments and compared to the Tower of Babel, becomes the symbol of sacrilegious pride, a deadly sin that explains its fall.⁶⁴

Thus it is not impossible that Joseph aimed at lay readers to whom he wanted to give a lesson. We may even be more precise. Joseph compares Hector's death to that of Henry III the Young King in the last verses of Book 5:

Tantus in Hectoreas audax excreverat iras
Tercius Henricus noster.

As great in daring, matching Hector's wrath, had grown / Our third great Henry.

JOSEPH, *Ylias*, 5, 533–534

This praise is ambiguous, for it refers to another deadly sin: wrath (*ira*). In fact Henry died uselessly, victim of his sterile revolt against his father, as Hector died uselessly since his death did not prevent the fall of Troy.⁶⁵ So we may perceive under the praise some irony and perhaps a warning addressed to Richard, Henry's brother, who was preparing the Third Crusade, preached successfully by the Archbishop of Canterbury. Richard must avoid destroying his life in pagan and sterile fights and devote himself to the only legitimate war, which joins under the banner of Christ and which Joseph intends to praise in a new epic, the *Antiocheis*, which he announces at the end of *Ylias*: *Nunc dicere votum / Christicolae acies* ("For now I wish / To speak of Christ's crusade," Joseph, *Ylias*, 6, 963–964). We may note that Gervase of Tilbury, a contemporary cleric, also compares Henry III to Hector and Paris, but names Richard *terre sancte strenuissimus defensor, timor gentilium, gladius et tutamen christianorum* ("vigorous defender of the Holy Land, terror to the heathens and protecting sword to Christians," *Otia imperialia*, 2, 21). So Joseph seems to have had the same project as Walter of Chatillon: to advise kings, there Philip Augustus, here Richard, in a context of Gregorian reform where clerics wanted to lead laymen.

63 Rigg (2001) 28. Cf. Lafferty (1998).

64 Mora (2011).

65 About Hector as image of the unruly *juvenes*, see Mora (2007).

Joseph of Exeter's *Ylias* is the accomplishment of Dictys' and Dares' enterprise in a Christian context. Their contestation of Homeric heroism results in the demonstration of the weakness of men without God. So it was rather successful during the Middle Ages and even beyond, till the early eighteenth century. Its main defect is probably the absence of the new epic announced by Joseph, but unfinished because of the death of Archbishop Baldwin, dead just after his arrival in the Holy Land. It would have praised Christian heroism.⁶⁶ Devoid of this stimulating counterpoint, the *Ylias* offers only a pessimistic picture of human nature, which may have disappointed some readers. It is perhaps the reason why Joseph was, for two centuries, "a forgotten poet".⁶⁷

Bibliography

Texts and Translations (into English and into French)

- Bate, A.K. (ed. and transl.) (1986) Joseph of Exeter, *Trojan War I–III*, Warminster.
- Eisenhut, W. (ed.) (1958 and 1973) *Dictys Cretensis ephemeridos belli Troiani libri*, Leipzig.
- Frazer, R.M. (transl.) (1966) *The Trojan War: the Chronicles of Dictys of Crete and Dares the Phrygian*, Bloomington.
- Fry, G. (transl.) (1998) *Récits inédits sur la guerre de Troie*, Paris.
- Gomph, L. (ed.) (1970) Joseph Iscanus, *Werke und Briefe*, Leiden.
- Meister, F. (ed.) (1873) *Daretis Phrygii de excidio Troiae historia*, Leipzig.
- Mora, F. and Tilliette, J.Y. (ed. and transl.) (2003) *L'Iliade, épopée du XI^e siècle sur la guerre de Troie*, Turnhout.
- Rigg, A.C. (transl.) (2005) Joseph of Exeter, *Iliad* (Josephus Iscanus, *Daretis Phrygii Ilias*), Toronto.

Books and Articles about Dictys and Dares

- Beschorner, A. (1992) *Untersuchungen zu Dares Phrygius*, Tübingen.
- Bradley, D.R. (1991) "Troy revisited," *Hermes* 119: 232–246.
- Callu, J.P. (1978) "Impius Aeneas? Echos virgiliens du Bas-Empire," in Chevallier, R. (ed.) (1978) *Présence de Virgile*, Paris, 161–183.

66 About *Ylias*' reception and this hypothesis, see Mora and Tilliette (2003) 36–39. We have today only five complete manuscripts of the *Ylias*, but Joseph's epic is often quoted in the Middle Ages. Only some verses of the *Antiocheis* are extant now.

67 Riddehough (1947). Before the modern edition of Gomph (1970), the last edition of the *Ylias* is dated from 1702.

- Diop, S. (2009) "L'image troyenne et sa fonction narrative chez Darès de Phrygie et Dictys de Crète," in Fartzoff, M., Faudot, M., Geny, E., and Guelfucci, M.R. (ed.) (2009) *Reconstruire Troie: permanence et renaissances d'une cité emblématique*, Besançon, 121–143.
- Faivre d'Arcier, L. (2006) *Histoire et géographie d'un mythe. La circulation des manuscrits du De excidio Troiae de Darès le Phrygien (VIII^e–XV^e siècles)*, Paris.
- Gianotti, G.F. (1979) "Le metamorfosi di Omero: il 'Romanzo di Troia' dalla specializzazione delle *scholae* ad un pubblico di non specialisti," *Sigma* 12: 15–32.
- Griffin, N.E. (1907) *Dares and Dictys: an Introduction to the Study of Medieval Versions of the Story of Troy*, Baltimore.
- Grillo, A. (1988) *Tra filologia e narratologia: dai poemi omerici ad Apollonio Rodio, Ilias latina, Ditti-Settimio, Darete Frigio, Draconzio*, Roma.
- Kim, L. (2010) *Homer between History and Fiction in Imperial Greek Literature. Greek culture in the Roman world*, Cambridge.
- Lumiansky, R.M. (1969) "Dares' *Historia* and Dictys' *Ephemeris*: a critical comment," in Bagby-Atwood, E. and Hill, A.A. (ed.) (1969) *Studies in Language, Literature and Culture of the Middle Age and later*, Austin, 200–209.
- Merkle, S. (1989) *Die Ephemeris Belli Troiani des Diktys von Kreta*, Frankfurt am Main.
- Merkle, S. (1990) "Troiani belli verior textus: Die Trojaberichte des Dictys und Dares," in Brunner, H. (ed.) (1990) *Die deutsche Trojaliteratur des Mittelalters und der Frühen Neuzeit. Materialien und Untersuchungen*, Wiesbaden, 491–522.
- Merkle, S. (1996) "The Truth and Nothing but the Truth: Dictys and Dares," in Schmeling, G. (ed.) (1996) *The Novel in the Ancient World*, Leiden, 563–580.
- Merkle, S. (1999) "News from the Past. Dictys and Dares on the Trojan War," in Hofmann, H. (ed.) (1999) *Latin Fiction. The Latin Novel in Context*, London, 155–166.
- Schetter, W. (1987) "Dares und Dracontius über die Vorgeschichte des Trojanischen Krieges," *Hermes* 115: 211–231.
- Schetter, W. (1988) "Beobachtungen zum Dares Latinus," *Hermes* 116: 94–109.
- Usener, K. (1994) "Dictys und Dares über den Troischen Krieg: Homer in der Rezeptionskrise?" *Eranos* 92: 102–120.

Books and Articles about Joseph of Exeter and His Contemporaries

- Bate, A.K. (1971) "Joseph of Exeter, Religious Poet," *Medium Aevum* 40: 222–228.
- Bossuat, R. (ed.) (1955) *Alain de Lille, Anticlaudianus*, Paris.
- Boutemy, A. (1946) "Le poème *Pergama flere volo* et ses imitateurs du XI^e siècle," *Latomus* 5: 233–244.
- Boutemy, A. (1946–1947) "La version parisienne du poème de Simon Chèvre d'Or sur la guerre de Troie: le ms. lat. 8430 de la Bibliothèque nationale," *Scriptorium* 1: 267–288.
- Constans, L. (ed.) (1904–1912) *Benoît de Sainte-Maure, Le Roman de Troie*, Paris.

- Dunkle, J.R. (1987) "Satirical Themes in Joseph of Exeter's *De bello Troiano*," *Classica et Mediaevalia* 38: 203–213.
- Gärtner, T. (1999) *Klassische Vorbilder mittelalterlicher Trojaepen*, Leipzig.
- Gianola, G.M. (1998) "Le *divinae personae* nell'*Ylias* latina di Giuseppe di Exeter," in Brusegan, R. and Zironi, A. (ed.) (1998) *L'Antichità nella cultura europea del Medioevo*, Greifswald, 43–50.
- Jung, M.R. (1996) *La légende de Troie en France au Moyen Age*, Tübingen.
- Jung, M.R. (1997) "L'histoire grecque: Darès et les suites," in Baumgartner, E. and Harf-Lancner, L. (ed.) (1997) *Entre fiction et histoire. Troie et Rome au Moyen Age*, Paris, 185–206.
- Kelly, D. (1999) *The Conspiracy of Allusion. Description, Rewriting, and Authorship from Macrobius to Medieval Romance*, Leiden, 121–145.
- Kretschmer, M.T. (2011) "Bourgueil, la nouvelle Athènes (ou Troie), et Reims, la nouvelle Rome. La notion de *translatio studii* chez Baudri de Bourgueil," *Latomus* 70: 1102–1116.
- Kretschmer, M.T. (2013) "Puer hic, ait, equet Homerum. Literary Appropriations of the Matter of Troy in Medieval Latin Poetry ca. 1070–1170 (Part 1)," *Mittelaltinisches Jahrbuch* 48: 41–54.
- Lafferty, M.K. (1998) *Walter of Chatillon's Alexandreis: Epic and the Problem of Historical Understanding*, Turnhout.
- Maas, M. (1899) "Juvenal und Josephus Iscanus," *Philologus* 58: 157–160.
- Mora, F. (2000) "Galerie de portraits et tombeau de Teuthras dans le livre IV du *De Bello Troiano* de Joseph d'Exeter: la perfection insaisissable," *PRIS-MA* 16: 249–265.
- Mora, F. (2003) "L'*Ylias* de Joseph d'Exeter: une réaction cléricale au *Roman de Troie* de Benoît de Sainte-Maure," in Baumgartner, E. and Harf-Lancner, L. (ed.) (2003) *Progrès, réaction, décadence dans l'Occident médiéval*, Genève, 199–213.
- Mora, F. (2006) "D'une esthétique à l'autre: la parole féminine dans l'*Iliade* de Joseph d'Exeter et le *Roman de Troie* de Benoît de Sainte-Maure," in Harf-Lancner, L., Mathey-Maille, L. and Szkilnik, M. (ed.) (2006) *Contes de Troie et d'Alexandre*, Paris, 31–50.
- Mora, F. (2007) "Couple modèle ou couple maudit? Hector et Andromaque dans l'*Iliade* de Joseph d'Exeter," *Anabases* 6: 101–112.
- Mora, F. (2008) "Crime et châtement dans l'*Iliade* de Joseph d'Exeter," in Ribémont B. (ed.) (2008) *Crimes et châtements dans la chanson de geste*, Paris, 55–74.
- Mora, F. (2010) "Renaissances de l'épopée ou satires de l'épopée? Du IX^e au XII^e siècle, l'Antiquité discutée dans l'*Iliade* et le *Waltharius*," in Masse, M.S. and Paoli, M. (ed.) (2010) *La Renaissance? Des Renaissances? (VIII^e–XVI^e siècles)*, Paris, 129–142.
- Mora, F. (2011) "Ville allégorique ou ville rêvée? Troie chez Joseph d'Exeter et Benoît de Sainte-Maure," in Imbert, C. and Maupeu, P. (ed.) (2011) *Le paysage allégorique, entre image mentale et pays transfiguré*, Rennes, 37–49.

- Mora, F. (2012) "Y a-t-il des circonstances atténuantes dans l'*Iliade* de Joseph d'Exeter et dans le *Waltharius*?" in Ribémont, B. (ed.) (2012) *La faute dans l'épopée médiévale. Ambiguïté du jugement*, Rennes, 205–218.
- Parker, H.C. (1995) "The Pagan Gods in Joseph of Exeter's *De bello Troiano*," *Medium Aevum* 64: 273–278.
- Ratkowitsch, C. (1991) *Descriptio Picturae. Die literarische Funktion der Beschreibung von Kunstwerken in der lateinischen Grossdichtung des 12. Jahrhunderts*, Wien, 318–352.
- Riddehough, G.B. (1947) "A Forgotten Poet: Joseph of Exeter," *Journal of English and Germanic Philology* 46: 254–259.
- Rigg, A.G. (1998) "Calchas, Renegade and Traitor: Dares and Joseph of Exeter," *Notes and Queries* 243: 176–178.
- Rigg, A.G. (2001) "Joseph of Exeter's Pagan Gods again," *Medium Aevum* 70: 19–28.
- Rouillé, F. (2010) "Alain de Lille et la poésie en loques. La critique de l'*Ilias* de Joseph d'Exeter dans l'*Anticlaudianus*," in Casanova-Robin, H. and Galand, P. (ed.) (2010) *Écritures latines de la mémoire, de l'Antiquité au XVI^e siècle*, Paris, 203–225.
- Sedgwick, W.B. (1930) "The *Bellum Troianum* of Joseph of Exeter," *Speculum* 5: 49–76.
- Stohlmann, J. (ed.) (1968) *Anonymi historia Troyana Daretis Frigii*, Düsseldorf.
- Tilliette, J.Y. (1993) "La *Descriptio Helenae* dans la poésie latine du XI^e siècle," *Bien dire et bien apprendre* 11: 419–432.
- Tilliette, J.Y. (1999) "Troiae ab oris. Aspects de la révolution poétique de la seconde moitié du XI^e siècle," *Latomus* 58: 405–431.
- Von Moos, P. (2005) *Entre histoire et littérature. Communication et culture au Moyen Age*, Firenze.

Robert Henryson's *Testament of Cresseid*: Transtextual Tragedy

Nickolas A. Haydock

Henryson's poem flouts the implied thresholds of a *continuation* in provocative ways. The poet himself was notoriously cagy about the matter. Not satisfied with the addition of a putative sixth book to Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*, he offers instead an alternate ending—a second fifth book, if you will—a supplement which threatens in the Derridean pun to *supplant*, troubling continuity and forcing us to make a choice between two mutually exclusive conclusions. The complications become more tightly knotted when in the opening frame Henryson takes up the question of competing versions only to slip into a delightfully perverse equivocation:

Quha wait gif all that Chauceir wrait was trew?
Nor I wait nocht gif this narratioun
Be authoreist, or fenyeit of the new
Be sum poeit. Throw his inuentioun
Maid to report the lamentatioun
And wofull end of this lustie Creisseid,
And quhat distress scho thollit, and quhat deid.¹

64–70

Who knows? Well, Henryson knew, and he wants us to know that he knew, that he knew rather too much about the speciousness of the medieval Troy story in general, descending as it does from the late antique forgers Dares and Dictys, who purported to offer eye-witness accounts of the Trojan War.

A fundamental divergence existed at the heart of the medieval Troy story concerning putatively *historical* accounts descending from Guido delle Colonne's *Historia destructionis Troiae* and the *romance* account of Troilus' tragic love, which Boccaccio elaborated from Benoit de Sainte-Maure's *Le Roman de Troie*. Henryson probably did not know Chaucer's chief source for the double sorrow of Troilus, Boccaccio's *roman à clef*, *Il Filostrato*, but he was intimately familiar with Lydgate's *Troy Book*, which struggles mightily to reconcile

1 All quotations of Henryson's works are taken from Fox (1980).

Chaucer's version of the story with Guido's pseudo-historical matter of Troy. Lydgate's aporias between the conflicting authorities of Guido and Chaucer in this massive work perhaps inspired Henryson's further adventures in what is today typically called "fan fiction," encouraging a final step from reconciling *auctores* to outright "inuentioun" (67). He claims to have "fand" (found) this version of the ending of the Troy story, just as in ancient rhetoric *inventio* refers to the discovery of arguments or material. Yet the narrator of Henryson's poem has not really come upon a lost manuscript but rather created a new story as a challenge (and in many ways as a conclusion) to existing accounts. The challenge extemporizes sophistically, suspending the priority of Chaucer's text.² Either Chaucer's version or Henryson's (or both) may be "authoreist or fenyeit of the new/ Be sum (modern) poeit" (66–67). Levelling the field in this way, the Scottish poet asks readers to choose between irreconcilable conclusions, both of which descend from unreliable and unidentifiable sources.

Transtextuality

Gerard Genette's *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree* (1997) provides a convenient critical vocabulary for analysing the intricate relationships between Henryson's poem and Chaucer's. Genette identifies five categories of what he calls *transtextuality*: "all that sets the text in a relationship, whether obvious or concealed, with other texts."³ By the first of these, *intertextuality*, Genette means something much more restrictive than Julia Kristeva: chiefly, the quotation of or allusion to another work, which signals a relationship, a "copresence." In the prologue to the *Testament*, Henryson presents himself as a reader of Chaucer's *Troilus*, a pose that obliquely cites Chaucer's own penchant for beginning poems such as *The Book of the Duchess* or *The Parliament of Fowls* with accounts of a reading experience.

To cut the winter nicht and mak it schort
 I tuik ane quair, and left all uther sport,
 Writtin be worthie Chaucer glorious
 Of fair Creisseid and worthie Troylus.

2 George Edmundson's engaging recent book, *The Neighboring Text*, insightfully marshals psychoanalytic discourse on the uncanny to suggest that the *Testament* is placed in "a relation of contiguity, contingency, chance proximity" with the *Troilus* in "an ethical encounter" (2011) 38.

3 Genette (1997) 1.

And thair I fand efter that Diomeid
 Ressavit had that lady bricht of hew
 How Troilus neir out of wit abraid
 And weipit soir with visage pail of hew
 For quhilk wanhope his teiris can renew
 Quhill Esperus rejoisit him agane.
 Thus quhyle in joy he levit, quhyle in pane.

Of hir behest he had greit comforting,
 Traisting to Troy that scho suld mak retour
 Quhilk he desyrit maist of eirdly thing
 For quhy scho was his only paramour.
 Bot quhen he saw passit baith day and hour
 Of hir ganecome than sorrow can oppres
 His wofull hart in cair and hevines.

Of his distres me neidis nocht reheirs
 For worthie Chauceir in the samin buik
 In gudelie termis and in joly veirs
 Compylit hes his cairis quha will luik.
 To brek my sleip ane vther quair I tuik
 In quhilk I fand the fatall destenie
 Of fair Cresseid that endit wretchitlie.

39–63

Chaucer himself began dream visions with extensive ruminations on ancient authorities, such as Ovid's *Metamorphoses* (in *The Book of the Duchess*) and Macrobius' *Commentary on the Somnium Scipionis* (in *The Parliament of Fowls*), before dreaming a new poem. English writers in the Chaucerian tradition—notably Hoccleve and Lydgate—often imitate Chaucer's scenes of reading classical authorities and his characteristic tropes in their elaborate tributes to “father Chaucer.”⁴ Henryson's prologue continues this tradition but also works to debunk it. The acrostic formed by the first letter of each line in the last quoted stanza serves to collapse the paraphrase of Chaucer's work with the material found in the “vther quair”; both seemingly invoked (and disposed) under the rubric “O Fictio.” Henryson's cagey metafictional games also work to set the two quires in a parallel, even appositional relationship. The first line of the

4 See Spearing (1985) 59–120; Ebin (1988) 1–48; and Lerer (1993).

précis of material from this other quire (62) quotes the first line of Chaucer's fifth and last book: "Aprochen gan the fatal destine" (5. 1), suggesting that the two quires, each of which begins with the exile of Cresseid from Troy, are parallel versions, even competing endings to the romance epic. Additionally, posing his work as a paraphrase or translation of a variant version allows Henryson to vitiate the belatedness that tends to beset many continuations. His work appears quite literally "co-present" with Chaucer's, "fand" (44 and 62) alongside it on the shelf, a position in stark contrast with English poets whose relationship to "master Chaucer" is characterized by what Seth Lerer calls "subjection."⁵

Genette labels his second category *paratextuality*. The paratextual realm occupies the "threshold" between the text and its interpretation in Genette's schema. Such thresholds frame the text, constituting it for its readers, but they also guide readers' approaches to the work. The title, *The Testament of Cresseid*, is likely authorial but also misleading in the extreme. Cresseid's "Testament" proper comes only near the very end of the poem and consists of scarcely 15 lines, the last and least elaborate of a series of rhetorical set pieces such as the planet portraits or the "Complaint" which compose the majority of the poem. Yet the puzzle of the title invites audiences to work out how—in Julia Boffey's terms—the "poem's status as moral exemplum in practice extends the sense in which it represents Cresseid's testament."⁶ Early in the poem the gods curse the heroine with the living death of leprosy, and the torturous process of coming to terms with her cruelly accelerated mortality is the poem's great theme. Indeed, Boffey suggests that the word here is equivalent "to the statement of belief or body of instruction that the word testament could also signify."⁷ I would take this even further to argue that the word functions to signal a coda to the Troy myth itself, a last word designed to dispose its effects and reassert its meaning in uncompromising, rigorously disambiguated terms.

Sir Francis Kinaston's preface to his Latin translation of the *Testament* (1639) surely represents one of the strangest early paratexts on record. It records an anecdote about Henryson's famous last words before the aged author's death by dysentery. As postmodern critics of the author function have demonstrated repeatedly, such stories typically read backwards from the works to the life in order to establish a place within a literary system and tether meaning to a fixed source.⁸ It is Kinaston who first dubs the work a "supplement" and suggests that

⁵ Lerer (1993) 1.

⁶ Boffey (1992) 54.

⁷ Boffey (1992) 54.

⁸ Foucault (1980) 102–120.

“it may passe for the sixt and laste book” of Chaucer’s work. It is also Kinaston who paints the portrait of the dying poet as a genial misogynist, whose wisdom and cunning make him impervious to the wiles of women. For Kinaston the *intentio scribendis* of the *Testament* is “to express the punishment and end due to a false vnconstant whore, which commonly terminates in extreme misery.”⁹ The anecdote of the dying Henryson shaming a witch brought in to cure him of the flux supports this reading of the poem. She runs from the house “derided and scorned” “in a great passion” not unlike the bitterly angry Cresseid we meet at the opening of the poem. While this story and its attendant interpretation are all of a piece—built on a death-bed anecdote which also featured in the biography of another Scottish writer, George Buchanan—together they have had an enormous influence on how Henryson’s text is read, even today.¹⁰

In his notion of *hypertextuality* Genette encompasses something akin to the definition of a mode of “second-degree” texts, those self-consciously expressing their relation to a “hypotext.” Parody and pastiche qualify, but Genette’s notion of second-degree literature is not confined to these kinds; rather, such texts constructed from and dependent on earlier texts are present in all genres. Genette defines the category as “any relationship uniting text B (which I shall call the hypertext) to an earlier text A (I shall, of course, call it the hypotext) upon which it is grafted.” Henryson’s *Testament* elaborately parodies the work it seems to complete. In both poems the opening scene occurs in a temple, but the differences are glaringly obvious. “The Complaint of Cresseid” (lines 407–469) elaborately parallels and parodies the *Canticus Troili* in Chaucer’s poem (l. 400–434), cruelly juxtaposing the metaphor of love as mortal sickness (“O quicke deth”) with a fatal venereal disease. Chaucer’s version presents Cupid’s arrow as revenging Troilus’ cocksure contempt of lovers; Henryson’s version shows Cupid and Venus demanding revenge for Cresseid’s blasphemy and “hir leuing vnclene and lecherous” (285), which Saturn delivers via a blighting arrow tipped with a leprous hailstone.¹¹ Chaucer’s last book dilates over a promised reunion of the lovers that never takes place; at the end of Henryson’s poem the two finally cross paths, but the ravages of Cresseid’s disease prevent them from recognizing each other. Indeed, Henryson’s text is so rigorously and thoroughly aligned with Chaucer’s that it hews closely to the literal meaning of *parody*—an *ode sung beside or against* another song.¹²

9 In Henryson, ed. Fox (1981) xiv.

10 For a more extensive discussion see Haydock (2010) 98–106.

11 Haydock (2010) 123–126.

12 See Genette (1997) 10–12 and Hutcheon (1985) 3–49.

There are many verbal parodies as well, the most salient of which wrenches Chaucer's courtly description of his heroine's beauty into an indignant condemnation of rampant lust:

Chaucer's version:

Among thise othere folk was Criseyda,
 In widewes habit blak; but natheles,
 Right as oure firste letter is now an A,
 In beaute first so stood she, makeles.
 Hire goodly lokyng gladed al the prees.
 Nas nevere yet seyn thyng to ben preysed derre,
 Nor under cloude blak so bright a sterre.¹³

l. 169–175

Henryson's version:

O fair Cresseid, the flour and A per se
 Of Troy and Grece, how was thow fortunait
 To change in filth all thy feminitie,
 And be with fleschelic lust sa maculait,
 And go amang the Greikis air and lait,
 Sa gigotlike takand thy foull pleasance!
 I haue pietie thow suld fall sic mischance!

78–84

Henryson's cruel parodies trace just how far Chaucer's Criseyde has fallen by means of what Genette would call an "intertextual pun": *makeles* (spotless, without a mate) becomes *maculait* (spotted, defiled).¹⁴ Indeed, the fact that the whole of Chaucer's stanza has been deliberately re-written for the purpose of mockery suggests that Henryson may well have taken his cue from the definitions of *parody* in classical rhetoric, which include both "punning substitution" and "the invention of verses resembling well-known lines" (Quint. *Inst.* 6.3.96–97).¹⁵

13 All quotations of Chaucer are taken from Benson, gen. ed. (1987), hereafter cited parenthetically in my text.

14 Genette (1997) 16.

15 For a general introduction to the possible influence of Quintilian on Henryson see: Kendrick (1993) 273–306.

The last of Genette's categories that I shall discuss here is his concept of the *architext*. The *architext* denotes the congeries of expectations readers bring to a text, chiefly based upon generic classifications. This category of transtextuality is the most stable, although what Rosalie Colie called the "resources of kind" do, of course, develop and evolve over time. In the case of Henryson's *Testament*, however, it is far from clear exactly what the poet meant to suggest in calling his poem a "tragedie" (4) or what associations he expected this term to evoke for a contemporary audience.

In fifteenth century Britain, the word *tragedy* had learned, classicizing connotations, but it was seldom associated with drama, ancient or otherwise. Chaucer dubs the brief narratives in "The Monk's Tale" "tragedies" (*Pro Mkt*, VII, 1971) and calls his *Troilus and Criseyde* a "tragedye" (5. 1786) near the end of that poem. In a general way, perhaps Henryson means to suggest a *de casibus* tragedy of Fortune akin to Chaucer's definition of the term:

Tragedie is to seyn a certeyn storie,
As olde books maken us memorie,
Of hym that stood in greet prosperitee,
And is yfallen out of heigh degree
Into myserie, and endeth wrecchedly.¹⁶

Pro Mkt, VII, 1973–1977

Indeed, the emphasis on a precipitous fall from the top of the social order into abject misery accords much better with Henryson's tragedy of Cresseid than with that of Chaucer's *Troilus*, who loses love and ultimately life, but never his aristocratic status. The gods blight Cresseid's beauty but also take away all she owns: "thy pomp and thy riches/ In mortall neid; and greit penuritee/ Thow suffer sall, and as an beggar die" (320–322).

Henryson's poem also reflects broad confusions about classical tragedy. Indeed, his most lurid addition to the traditional Trojan material—the suggestion that Cresseid falls into a life of prostitution and thence into venereal disease—probably reflects medieval misapprehensions about the genre descending from early texts such as Boethius' *Consolation of Philosophy* and St. Jerome's *Adversus Jovinianum*. Boethius' Lady Philosophy bans the tragic muses from the bedroom of her patient, calling them *scenicas meretriculas* (which Chaucer translated "commune strumpettis of swich place as men clepen the

16 The fullest and most systematic account on tragedy in late-medieval England is Kelly (1997) 40–69.

theatre").¹⁷ Jerome's anti-feminist tract was the favourite book of the Wife of Bath's fifth husband and a key authority: it claimed, "all the tragedies of Euripides are curses against women ... everything in swollen tragedies, everything that subverts honour, cities and kingdoms is connected with disputes over wives and whores."¹⁸ Such authoritative statements helped to create ideas about the genre, persistent misprisions, which composed the late-medieval *architext* of tragedy upon which Henryson drew and upon which he depended in composing a work that categorizes itself as "this tragedie" (4) in the opening stanza.¹⁹

Mr. In-between

I will have more to say on late-medieval tragedy below, but first I need to introduce a complication of Genette's taxonomy that Henryson's *Testament* appears to demand. Theories of intertextuality such as those of Kristeva and Genette have typically failed to account in any substantive way for specific mediations of literary influence and imitation, the ways in which intermediate texts shape the response of a later text to an earlier one. Such triangulations of influence should not be dismissed as an unnecessary complication; they are prerequisite to any responsible attempt to integrate theories of intertextuality with the practice of literary history. More specifically, they encourage us to attend to the functioning of literary traditions within a text—whether explicit or implicit. There are distinct texts between Chaucer's poem and Henryson's, *intermediate* intertexts if you will, which mediate and channel the Scot's ambivalent response to English literary history.

Antony C. Spearing nominated Chaucer "the father of English literary history" and in so doing helped to inaugurate an intensive vetting of the Chaucer tradition, much of it early on drawing heavily upon Harold Bloom's psychoanalytically inflected theory of the "anxiety of influence."²⁰ Latterly, monographs on the Chaucer tradition by Seth Lerer and Lois Ebin, in particular, have unpacked the ways in which Chaucer's earliest readers and imitators used his works to fashion a native literary history. Central to this invention of tradition is the idea of an English triumvirate of poets on a par with the great ancients

17 Boethius, I, pr. i, 29; Chaucer, I, pr. I, 49–50.

18 Quoted in Kelly (1997) 63–64.

19 More extensive discussions of tragic ideas in Henryson's poem are available in Kelly (1997) 216–259; McKenna (1994); and Haydock (2010) 107–154.

20 Bloom (1973).

or late-medieval Italians: Dante, Petrarch and Boccaccio. From the middle of the fifteenth century, Chaucer, Gower, and Lydgate become linked in George Ashby's (c. 1470) words as "the premier poetes of this nacion."²¹ Osborn Bokenham (c. 1447) may well have been the first to group the three, but by the early years of the sixteenth century this poetic triumvirate is already firmly established as an important and influential convention. Extensive tributes to the triumvirate infuse the works English and Scottish makers such as Hawes and Skelton and Dunbar and Douglas. Chaucer is typically the first among equals, while opinions about Gower and Lydgate vary widely. At the end of *The Golden Targe*, Dunbar invokes "reverend Chaucere, rose of rethoris all" (253) and in the next stanza groups the "morall Gower" and "Ludgate laureate" (262).²² *The Lament for the Makars* has Death pitifully devouring "The noble Chaucer of makaris flour/ The Monk of Bery, and Gower, all thre" (50–51) together.²³ Stephen Hawes is likewise non-judgmental. Gavin Douglas and John Skelton seem to agree on the prolix Lydgate, however. Douglas judges Chaucer "a per se sans peir" and imagines Lydgate *sans* companions, riding and musing alone.²⁴ In a sentence that probably represents a parody Lydgate's difficult style as well a criticism of it, Skelton complains: "It is diffuse to find/ The sentence of his mind."²⁵

Dunbar was not the first to give Gower the epithet "moral." Hawes employs it too. John Walton in 1410 transfers the epithet to Gower's work, the *Confessio Amantis*, as does John Rastell in 1520.²⁶ All this descends, of course, from the envoy at the end of the *Troilus* where Chaucer bequeaths his poem to two contemporary authors, John Gower and "philosophical" Strode:

O moral Gower, this book I directe
To the and to the, philosophical Stode,
To vouchen sauf, ther need is to corecte,
Of youre benignites and zeles goode.

5. 1856–1859

Of Strode we know precious little, not even which Strode was the intended addressee—the logician or the poet—and Henryson likely knew nothing at all. But of Gower he knew rather more, more in fact than we have tended to

21 Spurgeon (1960) 54–55.

22 Dunbar, ed. Kinsley (1979) 37.

23 Dunbar, ed. Kinsley (1979) 179.

24 Spurgeon (1960) 66.

25 Spurgeon (1960) 69.

26 Spurgeon (1960) 21, 73.

credit him with. The naming of "moral Gower" as the co-executor of the *Troilus* almost certainly prompts Henryson's construction of so recognizably a Gowerian persona for his narrator. Chaucer had emphasized Gower's reputation as a moral poet and invited him to correct the poem. The end of Gower's *Confessio Amantis* returns the friendly allusion, inviting Chaucer to confess as Gower has done in the guise of Amans. The passage calls upon Chaucer to complete his poetic work—always a problem for this worldly poet—and to cap his literary oeuvre with a "testament of love" (8. 2955).²⁷ Henryson could well have had this exchange in mind when he titled his own poem *The Testament of Cresseid*.

The recasting of the cure of Amans in Gower also displaces or reassigns many of the elements in Gower's pseudo-autobiography in significant ways. Like Amans, old age has taken the narrator of the *Testament* by surprise, perhaps because unrequited love has also aged him prematurely and unawares. Amans' petition acknowledges the malign influence of Venus and Saturn in collusion: "Bot whan sche takth hir conseil with Satorne,/ Ther is no grace" (8. 2275–2276). Henryson's narrator suffers from this collusion, but so too, of course, does his heroine, Cresseid. As is typical of Henryson's imitations, his narrator reprises the role of Amans imperfectly. The flesh is weak but the spirit is also unwilling. His "corage is doif and deid" (32), and his desire has withered into a preterit subjunctive: "I trustit that Venus, lufis queen,/ my faidit hart of lufe scho wald mak grene" (24). Loyalty to the goddess of love has also gone the way of desire. Cold winds numb his devotion to Venus and force him to withdraw (against his will) from her temple. Gower's Amans prays that Venus will either kill or cure him, assuring her that "my peine is evere aliche grene" (8. 2296). Cupid and Venus appear in answer to this prayer and love's arrow is drawn from the dreamer's heart, curing him of a chronic disease that had both defined him and made him oblivious of his own life passing in the blink of an eye. Cresseid is struck down with a leprous arrow (or so I have argued elsewhere), and wakes, like Amans, to see a blighted, wasted image of herself in a mirror.²⁸ But the narrator of the *Testament* avoids the decisive confrontation with the divine that cures Amans and kills Cresseid. He does not dream and record his dream in books; rather, he forces himself to stay awake and avoids immediate contact with the power of love, contenting himself with booze and books, which cut the cold and break his sleep. Amans feels his vital flame extinguished, and the cold threatens to overwhelm him—just as it does Henryson's narrator.

27 Gower, ed. Macauley, vol. 2 (1900) 466, hereafter cited by book and line number within the text.

28 Haydock (2010) 123–130.

Both perforce make a “beau retret” (8. 2416) from service to Venus, because (to keep things polite) neither can any longer “hold love his covenant” (8. 2420). But the self-mocking humour helps to open a critical, ironic distance between the persona and the Chaucer’s poem, which Henryson’s Gowerian narrator reads a hundred years later in a colder, less forgiving climate. And, all richly evocative extenuations of the modesty *topos* aside, Henryson’s poem is as uncompromising a cure for lust as we are likely to find anywhere in late medieval British literature, with the possible exemption of Gower’s own final tale, Apollonius of Tyre, where the incestuous villain Antiochus also “for his lust hath his penance” (8. 2008). Being a moral poet does not preclude ethical complexity or sympathy for human suffering, but it does necessitate the construction of moral exempla whose fates serve the purpose of didactic poetry. In assuming the Gowerian persona Henryson presumes to *correct* the moral ambivalence of Chaucer’s wayward heroine. By the end of the Scottish version, even Cresseid will proclaim herself an example to other women, and she will extol the virtues of Troilus in equally uncompromising terms: “fals Cresseid and trew knicht Troilus” (546).

If Henryson’s channelling of “moral Gower” facilitates the construction of a moral perspective intensely concerned with exemplarity and how Chaucer’s erotic romance can be made to pertain to ethics, Lydgate’s *Troy Book* weighs even heavier in what Henryson does to Chaucer. In Lydgate, as in Gower, we are dealing with something akin to a vanishing mediator, through which Henryson orchestrates his transformation of Chaucer’s *Troilus*.

An unintended consequence of the construction of literary historical anti-canon such as the “Chaucer Apocrypha” or the “Chaucer Tradition” is the invitation to read these works synchronically, as a constellation of responses to Chaucer, while ignoring or discounting their relationships to each other. For instance, A.C. Spearing’s influential literary history, *Medieval to Renaissance in English Poetry* (1985) finds in Lydgate’s *Troy Book* “a coarse-grained misreading of Chaucer’s tone” in which Henryson does not share, because he “grasped the paradox of Chaucer’s sympathetic portrayal of a notorious female deceiver.”²⁹ C. David Benson accepts Spearing’s premise and proceeds to outline “some of the ways that Henryson’s response ... differ(s) from Lydgate’s” (225).³⁰ Edmondson’s (2011) recent book treats the versions of Boccaccio, Chaucer and Henryson synchronically, as “neighbouring” texts, without mentioning Lydgate at all. What is transsumed in these synchronic literary histories is the central place

29 Spearing (1985) 181.

30 Benson (1995) 225.

of Lydgate in narratives of Chaucer's influence. In late medieval and early modern writing after Lydgate, no matter how Chaucerian it appears, we are to some very great extent reading responses to Lydgate's Chaucer. Also, in the modern wish to gift Henryson with a greater sympathy than Lydgate to the complexities of Chaucer's poem, we are in essence only reduplicating the dichotomy between sympathy and renunciation in the *Troilus* itself.

Indeed, Henryson's famous prologue to the *Testament* borrows from Lydgate's own prologue to the *Troy Book* not only its doubts about the veracity Trojan histories, it also abstracts a poetics of allusion from it:

Al-be that somme han the trouthe spared
 In her writyng and pleylnly not declared
 So as it was nor tolde out feithfully
 But it transformed in her poysy
 Thorough veyne fables, which of entencioun
 They han contrevyed by false transumpcioun
 To hyde trouthe falsely under cloude,
 And the sothe of malys for to schroude,
 As Omer dide, the whiche in his writyng
 I-feyned hathe ful many diuers thyng
 That neuer was, as Guydo list diuise,
 And thingys done in a-nother wyse
 He hathe transformed than the trouthe was
 And feyned falsly that goddis in this caas
 The worthi Grekis holpen to werreye
 (...)
 For in makyng, love hath lost his syght,
 To yeve a pris wher noon is disserved.
 Cupide is blynde, whos domys ben observyd
 More after lust than after equité
 Or after resoun, how the trouthe be.

Prologue, 259–273; 284–288

Here in the prologue and throughout his work Lydgate will exempt Chaucer's own Troy narrative from the criticism he lavishes on Homer. But his willingness to exalt both the truth of Guido delle Colonne's putative history, as well as the authority of Chaucer's romance version opens a series of rifts within his text, which his reverence for Chaucer will not allow him to close. The traditional blindness of both Homer and Cupid is deftly transsumed as biased affection, leading to deceitfulness, but Chaucer's own vaunted partiality for his heroine

is indulged with reverence. Lydgate's use of the term "false trasumpcioun" is provocative. Ancient rhetorics liken *transumptio* to *catachresis* or *abusio*, hence an over-wrought and perhaps disreputable figure. In *De Tropes* Bede defines the term as "*ab eo quod praecedit id quod sequitur insinuans*" (suggesting from that which comes first, that which follows it).³¹ Given the conventional praise of Chaucer as the English Homer throughout the late Middle Ages, one could argue that Lydgate's critique of the transumptive Homer implies a criticism too of Chaucer's own blindness with respect to his heroine, which he could not bring himself to state more directly. What is certain is that later Scots like Henryson and Douglas would foreground the question of Chaucer's historical veracity much more directly, for as Douglas demurs: "he was evir, God wait, all weminis frend." The letter to Can Grande characterizes the mode of Dante's *Comedia* as "transumptive," in order to distinguish it from literal, historical discourse. According to John Hollander, upon whom my discussion of the figure heavily relies, late medieval rhetorics usually include three principles in defining transumption: 1. "a transition from one trope to another"; 2. the tropes are "in some way anterior and posterior"; and 3. "there are one or more unstated (...) but associated figures transsumed by the trope which are to be reconstructed through interpretation."³² We might unite the three principles to define transumption as a mysterious or complicated figurative allusion to another figure whose sense must be constructed by supplying an unstated element. Hollander concludes from this that transumption or metalepsis is a figure of "interpretive allusion." Lydgate's use of the term *false trasumpcioun* also seems to emphasize the deceitfulness inherent in (belated) poetic invention itself, the addition of false material by later poets, just as the professed eye-witness to the Trojan War, Dares the Phrygian, claimed Homer had done. Lydgate could not have known that this first-century forgery was itself a false transumption of Homer, a redaction that claimed precedence and denied authority to that from which it was in fact derived. But Henryson may well have known, for what he does to Chaucer is precisely what Dares did to Homer.

Lydgate's *Troy Book* is not so much Henryson's "vther quair" as it is the source of his doubts about conflicting sources of the story. At the beginning of his Prologue to book five, Lydgate narrates the end of the storm that had plagued the Greeks' attempts to return home so that "cloude noon in hevene did appere." This meteorological pattern of "boilyng" (5.11) stormy weather followed by a clear and calm sky is likely the source of Henryson's similar

31 Quoted in Hollander (1981) 144.

32 Hollander (1981).

opening passage. In his version the north wind "*purifyit the aire,/ And sched the mistie cloudis fra the sky.*" As seen above, the prologue to the first book of Lydgate's *Troy Book* associates cloud cover and deceptive stories: "*veyn fables*" which contrive through "*false transumpcioun*" "*To hyde trouthe falsely under cloude/ And the sothe of malys for to schroude,/ As Homer dide*" (Prologue, 263–267). The beginning of Chaucer's *Troilus* famously likens Criseyde's beauty to that of a bright star behind a dark cloud ("nor under cloude blak, so bright a sterre," 1. 175). Henryson's use of the trope thus constructs a transumptive chain, a figurative use of clouds that tropes Lydgate's troping of Chaucer's first image of Criseyde to signal an end to feminine and authorial duplicity. Lydgate's Book 5 Prologue goes on to emphasize that the tranquil weather allowed the return of the Greeks to their homeland, but the calm did not quiet their inner storms, which raged with rancour, jealousy and a blasphemous lack of respect for the gods. Cresseid's own *nostos* to the house of her father is characterized likewise by an angry, unquiet soul, which like that of the other victims such as Ajax and Agamemnon calls down upon her a divine vengeance (about which more below).

Perhaps the most garish of Henryson's additions to the matter of Troy, an addition that had devastating effects on the reputation of Criseyde in the Renaissance, is his suggestion that after being abandoned by Diomedes she fell into prostitution. This too is the result of an especially pernicious transumptive chain in which Lydgate supplies the central link. Chaucer's moral Hector had objected strenuously to the exchange of Criseyde for Antenor, protesting: "we usen here no wemen for to selle." Lydgate ironically revives the phrase in an extended anti-feminist outburst that follows the transfer of Criseyde's affections to Diomedes:

yet al day men may it se
It shewed oute at large fenestralis,
On chaubers highe, and lowe down in hallis,
And in wyndowes eke men may with hem mete
At pilgrymages and oblaciounes,
At spectacles in cytés and in townys
(As seith Guydo), and al is for to selle.

3. 4322–4329

Lydgate repeatedly maintains that he confines himself to and even greatly abridges Guido's anti-feminist tirades, here as elsewhere the attempt to shift responsibility is disingenuous in the extreme because he greatly enhances what is only only a brief mention of prostitutes in his source. The application of

all this to Criseyde is only implied in Lydgate, it is only in Henryson's prologue that the spark finally jumps the gap to outright accusation.

Those who like Spearing contend that Henryson "heightened the compassion" in comparison to Lydgate's treatment of Criseyde and that he did not share Lydgate's "misreading of Chaucer" need to account for this vicious transumption.³³ In fact the seemingly puzzling vacillation in the last two lines of the stanza ("Sa gigotlike takand thy foul pleasance/ I haue pietie thow suldfall sic mischance," 83–84) exactly reproduces the tension in Lydgate's text between Guido's misogyny and Chaucer's sympathy.

The Testament of Cresseid as Tragic Nostos

Lydgate mediated Henryson's invention of a tragedy for Chaucer's heroine as well. The furtive Criseyde seems almost to evaporate at the end of the fifth and last book of Chaucer's poem. Troilus awaits her return to Troy, feverishly counting the days until their promised reunion, and turns from hope to despair as it becomes increasingly clear that she will not return, having taken up instead with the reprehensibly "sodeyn Diomede" (5.1024). Criseyde speculates plangently on her future in literature, prophesying that,

Allas, of me, unto the worldes ende,
Shal neyther ben ywriten nor ysonge
No good word, for thise bokes wol me shende.
O, rolled shal I ben on many a tonge!
Thoroughout the world my belle shal be ronge!

5.1058–1061

This is but one of the prophecies in Chaucer's text that Henryson accomplishes. A vindictive "Cupid the king ringand ane siluer bell,/ Quhilk men nicht heir fra heuin vnto hell" (144–145) summons the planetary gods down from their spheres to sit in judgment over the wayward heroine.

Yet Henryson's tragic plot, however ironically and instructively it mirrors Chaucer's fifth book, seems chiefly indebted to the fifth book of Lydgate's *Troy Book*. Guido's *Historia destructionis Troiae* appends the stories of the Greeks' homeward journeys after the sack of Troy. Lydgate includes these in his faithful translation, but also follows the Chaucerian precedent of dividing his work

33 Spearing (1985) 181.

on the matter of Troy into five books. The *Troy Book's* fifth book serves as a collection of difficult, delayed or tragic homecomings. Telemonian Ajax dares to question Ulysses' enormous share of the spoils and the next morning is found murdered in his bed. Aeneas calls Antenor home on a false pretext, so that he can be charged with treason and executed. The two Trojan traitors quarrel among themselves, each exposing the deceits of the other, and both are exiled. Oileus Ajax has incurred the wrath of Minerva because he "woodly" (5. 671) breached the sanctity of her temple to rape the suppliant Cassandra. Bringing one's anger within the precincts of a pagan temple betrays self-destructive impulses. The verbal similarities suggest that Henryson perhaps had in mind this episode in composing his own scene of blasphemy in a temple:

By cruel force and hatful violence
Lo, what peril is to done offence
Of highe despit to any holy place.

5. 673–675

In the *Testament*, Cupid rather oddly accuses Cresseid of "sic violence" (292); she is sentenced to death "for the dispyte" "oppin and manifest" (304–305) done to the gods of love; and laments in similar terms "Lo, quhat it is (...) to mufe and steir/ Our craibit goddis" (351–353).

There are other distinct verbal borrowings from Lydgate's tales of coming home, borrowings that, had they been registered by scholars, might well have made these words in Henryson's poem less surprising and controversial. For instance, in Lydgate, "Egistus" (Aegisthus), the shady practitioner of "doublinnesse" and "newfongillesse," divorces a king's daughter: "And in al haste dide a lybel make,/ And forge a writ of repulsioun" (5. 1536–1537), for the simple reason that he wishes to marry Clytemnestra instead. Henryson's Diomedes issues a "lybel of repudie" (74) to Cresseid for the same reason, because "Vpon ane vther he set his hail delyte" (73). The crucial point here is not a secret marriage, nor does it reveal anything in particular about the poet's knowledge of law; rather more simply, Henryson's Diomedes, like Lydgate's Egistus, is a ruthless cad. In Lydgate, "worthi Diomedes" is often treated sympathetically, as, for example, when in exile from his home he finds "him silf ashamed and confus,/ As man forsake, abiect, and refus" (5. 1333–1334). This is the most likely source of the rare word "abiect" (133) in the *Testament*, and Henryson's citation functions ironically. Like her former lover, Cresseid wanders dejectedly: he awaiting a reunion with his wife, she "into the court, common" (77) as a prostitute.

Lydgate also recounts at length the "home comynge" (5. 2139, 2344, 3214, etc.) of Agamemnon, Ulysses, and Pyrrhus, who is finally slain in Apollo's

temple by Orestes, but not before he plays out a curious and pathetic scene of misrecognition with his grandfather Peleus.

And vnwarly, with a dredful hert,
 Pelleus oute of the caue sterte
 Disamayed, of his lyf in doute,
 Whan he beheld a knight there walke aboute,
 And astonyd abood and stood full stille,
 Imaginyng that he sawe Achille,
 By this Pirrus stondyng in the place,
 By alle the signes shewid in his face:
 For nature, with-oute variaunce,
 Made hem so lik of chere and contenance,
 Of form, of shap, and lymys euerychon,
 That difference in effect was noon.

5. 2413–2424

It would be misleading to over-emphasize the importance of this passage as a source for the more elaborate scene of misrecognition at the end of the *Testament*. Henryson's version is denser, psychologically and emotionally, and the delayed recognition of the lovers leads them both to devastating conclusions about each other and about erotic love more generally. The fact of mutual misrecognition in the *Testament* also has deliberate connotations, suggesting perhaps that neither lover ever really *knew* the other. In addition, Cresseid is spiritually as well as physically not the same woman Troilus once knew. Returning home after a triumph in battle, Troilus crosses paths with Cresseid among a group of lepers begging by the roadside:

Than to their cry nobill Troylus tuik heid,
 Hauing pietie, near by the place can pas
 Quhair Cresseid sat, not witting quhat scho was.

Than vpon him scho kest vp baith hir ene,
 And with ane blenk it come into his thocht
 That he sumtime hir face befor had sene,
 Bot scho was in sic plye he knew hir nocht;
 Yit than hir luik into his mynd it brocht
 The sweit visage and amorous blenking
 Of fair Cresseid, sumtyme his awin darling.

Na wonder was, suppois in mynd that he
 Tuik hir figure sa sone, and lo, now quhy:
 The idole of ane thing in cace may be
 Sa deip imprentit in the fantasy
 That it deludes the wittis outwardly,
 And sa appeiris in forme and lyke estait
 Within the mynd as it was figurait.

495–511

But if it would be misleading to make too much of Henryson's source in Lydgate for this justly celebrated scene, it is catastrophic to ignore it completely—as is done routinely in critical treatments of this passage. Henryson is a vastly superior poet; he perhaps even consciously attempts to outdo the prolix and sometimes dull Monk of Bury, but a great deal of what the Scottish schoolmaster imagines tragedy to be comes directly from Lydgate. Certainly, the scene echoes archly those moments in Chaucer where one or the other lover is said to be unrecognizable because of the suffering love has caused them (e.g. 5. 1402–1404), but the chief source of the misrecognition episode is Lydgate—even if its quality is light years beyond Lydgate's capabilities.

The tragic *nostos* or “home comynge” of Cresseid is in keeping with the ambivalent tone of the work as a whole. Cresseid never returns to Troy after her sojourn “amang the Greikis.” Instead she ventures a mile two beyond the Greek settlement to the house of her father, Calchas, for a tearful reunion. He welcomes her warmly but uncannily, calling her “full deir ane gest!” (105); soon he is ushering the stricken patient in secret to “spittail hous” (391) a half mile further down the road. This exile by degrees figures Cresseid increasing isolation: she delivers her formal complaint: “In ane dark corner of the hous alone” (405). Like many wanderers incognito, her status as a beggar helps to conceal her identity and makes possible a dramatic recognition scene. In more ways than one a failed and female Ulysses—her harshest critic in Shakespeare's play—Cresseid even changes epithets from “fair” to “fals” before finally being brought face to face with her love. Her failure to return to Troy in Chaucer is offset by the failure of both lovers to recognize one another or to be reunited. The shock of Cresseid's tragic anagnorisis soon kills her, but not before she disambiguates the two loves and two lovers: “O fals Cresseid and trew knicht Troilus!” (546 and, with slight variations, 553 and 560).³⁴

34 On the scene of misrecognition see especially: Boitani (1989) 136–138 and Haydock (2010) 227–233.

Finally, the question of poet's attitude to his heroine and the apparent vacillation between sympathy for the trials of "fair Cresseid" and misogynist condemnations of "fals Cresseid" is, I would argue, mooted by a recognition of the extent to which this confusion is inherent in the history of Troy as Henryson received it from Lydgate. When at the end of the text Cresseid's voice has been brought fully into line with her poet, she too seems to have been reading Lydgate. After her betrayal of Troilus in the *Historia*, Guido steps back from the narrative to launch a misogynist tirade against the faithlessness of women in general. Lydgate demurs in a recognizably Chaucerian way, citing counter examples of good women, whose virtue has earned them a place beyond the stars and the "nynthe spere" (3. 4328), to which Troilus also ascends at the end of Chaucer's poem. Lydgate's defence of women attacks Guido's logic, arguing that one woman's "indiscrecioun" does not justify condemning the whole gender: "For cause of oon for to hindren alle" (3. 4360). He estimates that there are a hundred good women for every bad one. Cresseid spends three stanzas eulogizing Troilus and condemning herself (540–560). The next two stanzas (561–574) generalize the message to all women, who are just as Guido claimed: faithless and subject to change, as stable as a weathercock in the wind (567). Cresseid estimates the ratio of good to bad women more conservatively than Lydgate: "Thocht sum be trew, I wait richt few ar thay" (572). Yet she resolves, "Nane bot my self as now I will accuse" (574). The *position* thus staked out on the relevance of Cresseid's story to woman in general is conceived as a reaction to Lydgate's attempt to carve out a position between Guido and Chaucer. To ignore the earlier contributions to this transtextual dialogue on the meaning of Criseyde's infidelity risks simplifying a controversial question that meant a great deal to the poets involved. That Henryson gives Cresseid herself the last word on this question is also an important innovation in the textual chain, one calculated not simply to continue the debate but to conclude it.

Bibliography

- Allen, G. (2011) *Intertextuality*. 2nd edn. London.
- Benson, C.D. (1998) "Critic and Poet: What Lydgate and Henryson Did to Chaucer's *Troilus and Criseyde*" in Pinti (1998) 227–242.
- Boethius. (1973) *Theological Tractates and The Consolation of Philosophy*. Cambridge.
- Bloom, H. (1973) *The Anxiety of Influence: A Theory of Poetry*. Oxford.
- Boffey, Julia. (1992) "Lydgate, Henryson, and the Literary Testament," *Modern Language Quarterly* 53.1: 41–56.
- Chaucer, G. (1987) *The Riverside Chaucer*. L.D. Benson, gen. ed. Oxford.

- Dunbar, William. (1979) *The Poems of Dunbar*. Ed. J. Kinsley. Oxford.
- Ebin, L.A. (1988) *Illuminator, Makar, Vates: Visions of Poetry in the Fifteenth Century*. Lincoln, NE.
- Edmondson, G. (2011) *The Neighboring Text: Chaucer, Boccaccio, Henryson*. Notre Dame.
- Foucault, M. (1980) *Language, Counter-Memory, and Practice*. New York.
- Genette, G. (1997) *Palimpsests: Literature in the Second Degree*. Trans. Ch. Newman and C. Doubinsky. Lincoln, NE.
- Gower, J. (1900) *The English Works of John Gower*. 2 vols. Ed. G.C. Macaulay. London.
- Haydock, N. (2010) *Situational Poetics in Robert Henryson's 'Testament of Cresseid'*. Amherst, NY.
- Henryson, Robert. (1981) *The Poems of Robert Henryson*. D. Fox, ed. Oxford.
- Hollander, J. (1981) *The Figure of Echo: A Mode of Allusion in Milton and After*. Berkeley.
- Hutcheon, L. (1985) *A Theory of Parody: The Teaching of Twentieth-Century Arts Forms*. New York.
- Kelly, H.A. (1997) *Chaucerian Tragedy*. Cambridge.
- Kindrick, R.L. (1993) *Henryson and the Medieval Arts of Rhetoric*. New York.
- Lerer, S. (1993) *Chaucer and his Readers: Imagining the Author in Late-Medieval England*. Princeton.
- Lydgate, J. (1906) *Lydgate's Troy Book*. Ed. H. Bergin. 3 vols. London.
- McKenna, S.R. (1994) *Robert Henryson's Tragic Vision*. New York.
- Pinti, D.J. (1998) *Writing After Chaucer: Essential Readings in Chaucer and the Fifteenth Century*. New York.
- Quintilian. (2002) *The Orator's Education*. Trans. D.A. Russell. 4 vols. Cambridge.
- Spearing, A.C. (1985) *Medieval to Renaissance in English Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Spurgeon, C.F.E. (1960) *Five Hundred Years of Chaucer Criticism and Allusion, 1357-1900*. New York.

Trojan Pasts, Medieval Presents: Epic Continuation in Eleventh to Thirteenth Century Genealogical Histories

Adam J. Goldwyn

1 The Origins of the Trojan Genealogical History in the Middle Ages: Dudo of San Quentin's *Gesta Normannorum* and the Norman Invasion of France

In the wake of the dissolution of Roman power in Europe, the smaller powers that rose to fill the power vacuum vied to carve pieces of the former empire for themselves. The majority of these medieval dynasties had established themselves in one of two ways: as invading foreign conquerors from elsewhere, as was the case with the Normans in France and England, or by establishing their pre-eminence among many squabbling local competitors, as in the case of the German and Swedish monarchies. These means of gaining and maintaining power, however, had none of the prestige or antiquity—and thus also none of the legitimacy—that a Roman pedigree, with its long and glorious history as a military and imperial power and as the seat of Christian power, could offer. Thus as they gained and consolidated power, they began to tell stories about themselves and their origins which would justify their power by means of ideology and history rather than force of arms alone. Across Europe, from Iceland and England to Italy and beyond, these dynasties legitimized themselves by claiming to be the true inheritors of the Roman Empire. Drawing on the model left by Virgil's *Aeneid*, they re-imagined themselves as the descendants of Trojan refugees whose founders, like Aeneas, were forced to flee Troy after its destruction and, by divine guidance, found a new and powerful dynasty that would endure for all time. In doing so, they also offered a new form of historiography, the Trojan genealogical history, to the literary history of epic continuation.

Though claims to Trojan descent can be found by the seventh century,¹ the early eleventh century saw the most forceful and influential assertion

1 Ingledew (1994) 676. Kendrick (1950) 3 notes that “one seventh-century legend stated outright that the Franks were dispossessed Trojans, of whom a party under King Francio had settled the Rhine; another story named four brothers Francus, Romanus, Britto, and Albanus, who in due course founded the united people of Merovingian Gaul.” See also Reynolds (1983) 375.

of the genealogical connection between Troy and Europe's ruling elite since Virgil: Dudo of St. Quentin's *Gesta Normanorum* (*History of the Normans*).² Dudo's work became the model for other medieval dynastic houses seeking to use genealogical histories to support their political legitimacy, both in the continuing tradition of Norman historiography by authors such as William of Jumièges, Robert of Torigni, and Ordericus Vitalis,³ and those further afield, such as Snorri Sturluson's *Prose Edda*, which claimed Trojan descent for the ruling families of Scandinavia and Northern Europe; Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History of the Kings of Britain*, which claimed Trojan descent for the British; and the Venetian chroniclers Marco and Martin da Canal.

At the end of the tenth century, Dudo's patron, Richard II, third duke of Normandy, commissioned him, "through a series of techniques ranging from blandishments and embraces to threats and insults"⁴ "to write something about 'customs, deeds, and right's established in the Norman land'"⁵ (*scilicet ut mores actusque telluris Normannicae, quin etiam proavi sui Rollonis quae posuit in regno jura describerem*⁶). Richard II's grandfather, Rollo, first duke of Normandy, having been driven from Scandinavia, had seized his territory in France through conquest and secured it through treaty with the French King Charles III. Rollo's legitimacy was based primarily upon his *de facto* military superiority as a foreign conqueror. His grandson, more firmly established on his throne, sought to provide some other, *de jure*, justification for his rule.⁷ Dudo's task, then, was to provide a history which justified the political power of the new dynasty, a task to which medieval ideas about historiography were well suited.⁸ Dudo thus claimed descent from the Trojans and, as Troy's imperial grandchildren, their right to rule a portion of the land ruled by Troy's Roman heirs. Dudo

2 Alternatively called *De Moribus et Actis Primorum Normanniae Ducum*. The manuscript tradition of the work is admirably described in Huisman (1984).

3 The texts of which can be found in Van Houts (1992).

4 Lifshitz (1994) 101.

5 Dudo (1998) xi.

6 Dudo (1865) 119.

7 For which, see Mortensen (1995) 91 and, for an opposite assessment, Lifshitz (1994) 101.

8 For which, see Spiegel (1997) xii. For analyses of the audiences for such works, that is to say, who needed convincing, see Lifshitz (1994) 103, who suggests that "the only individual known to have been singled out as a target audience [was] Bishop Adalbero of Laon." In his discussion of the intended audience of the genealogical history, Mortensen (1995) 101 suggests a somewhat broader audience of "Norman—and the northern Frankish—clergy," to whom "the dynasty which still seemed somewhat barbaric."

creates this genealogical and dynastic connection to Troy and, through Troy, to Rome, in two ways. First, early on in the work, he makes explicit a genealogical connection:

The *Daci* call themselves *Danai*, or Danes, and boast that they are descended from Antenor; who, when in former times the lands of Troy were laid waste, 'slipped away through the middle of the Greeks' and 'penetrated' the confines 'of Illyria' with his own men.⁹

*Igitur Daci nuncupantur a suis Danai, vel Dani, gloriantique se ex Antenore progenitos; qui, quondam Trojae finibus depopulatis, mediis elapses Achivis, Illyricos fines penetravit cum suis.*¹⁰

The Dacians, who would later come to be inhabitants of Normandy, had traced their descent from the Trojans, and this genealogical connection to Trojans, and through them, to Romans, provided Richard II with just such a justification for his ruling part of the former Roman Empire.¹¹ Their homeland, Dacia, was also imbued with a royal origin: Dudo's world is divided into three continents: Asia, Europe, and Africa, of which Europe is, according to him, the best; within Europe, the provinces of Germany are the best, of which "Dacia stands in the middle, looking like a crown, or resembling a city fortified by the Alps."¹² (*Dacia exstat medioxima, in modum coronae, instarque civitatis, praemagnis Alpibus emunita.*¹³) In Dudo's conception of geography, Dacia is the king of lands: it is richest, it is in the centre, and, metaphorically, it wears a crown. The king of earthly lands produced the rightful kings of that land: first the Trojans, then their descendants, the Romans, and, in Dudo's own day, their descendants, the Normans.

Second, these explicit claims of legitimacy in the text are buttressed by his literary and stylistic presentation of them by modelling his account of the life

9 Dudo (1998) 17.

10 Dudo (1865) 130.

11 One of Dudo's continuators, Saxo Grammaticus, alters his account of the Trojan history of the Danes, omitting Antenor entirely. Friis-Jensen (1995) 12 astutely notes that this is because of the differing claims to political legitimacy each author creates: while Dudo legitimizes through Rome and Troy, Saxo "wants to make it clear that the Danes are autochthonous ... [H]e wants his readers to see Scandinavian culture as a development which is parallel to Greco-Roman culture, not a derivation of it."

12 Dudo (1998) 15.

13 Dudo (1865) 129.

of Rollo, the founder of the Norman dynasty, on Virgil's Aeneas, transposing the events of the Trojan hero's life and the sack of his city to contemporary medieval life and substituting the role of Roman religion with Christianity.¹⁴ That is, he shaped the account of Rollo's exploits to fit what Ingledew calls a "Virgilian scheme."¹⁵ Virgil's conception of genealogical history became the most influential for a variety of reasons. Homer's account of the Trojan War was lost to Western Europe during the Middle Ages, and those who were aware of it believed Homer to be biased against the Trojans, whose descendants the medieval historians were meant to glorify. Though Dares and Dictys were the primary sources for factual knowledge about the Trojan War, and though their works did indeed describe many of the Trojans' wanderings, their works lacked the element of prophecy that would give the otherwise secular founding of new dynasties political legitimacy through divine sanction. The pattern of exile, wandering, prophecy, and city founding (a metonymy for dynastic foundation) in *The Aeneid* makes that work the literary model for examples of epic continuation in several other medieval genealogical histories, including Dudo's.

Rollo's story begins with a war against an enemy king, which ends with Rollo's defeat in a way similar to the Trojan defeat at the hands of the Greeks: "Conflict between the king and Rollo continued for the space of five years, and then the king sent him words of peace, such as these, in trickery."¹⁶ (*Unius vero lustris spatio preservante inter regem et Rollonem duello, inisit rex pacificis verbis ad eum hujusmodi in dolo.*¹⁷) As with Aeneas and the Trojans, Rollo believes the long war to be over, only to be defeated by treachery in the form of a false peace; his city is sacked and many of his men are killed; he flees, like Aeneas, with a small band of followers by ship.¹⁸

The account of Rollo's defeat and flight, written in prose, is then interrupted by a prophecy in hexameter verse, the epic metre, which is reminiscent of the *Aeneid*'s prophecies of the founding of the new homeland in Italy:

14 See, for example, Stok (1999), for whom the *Gesta Normanorum* is a new *Aeneid*, with the parallelling of Aeneas' and Rollo's flights and the wars in Normandy and the founding of the dynasty as the equivalent of Aeneas' war against the Rutulians (thus casting Dudo as the new Virgil); Bouet (1990), for whom Dudo's emulation of Virgil has both literary and ideological ramifications; Searle (1984), who argues that Dudo is not pedantic or slavish in his use of Aeneas as a pattern for Rollo.

15 Ingledew (1994) 666.

16 Dudo (1998) 27.

17 Dudo (1865) 143.

18 For a similar analysis of Rollo's flight as imitating Aeneas', see Albu (2001) 16.

Wealth will be showered on Rollo, affluence on him be conferred;
 Francia, you will be fruitful in your fortunate offspring
 Formed of the seed commingled of noble Christian believers
 Once there is peace between Francia's sons and the Dacians,
 Then will she breed and give birth, and pregnant, bring forth
 Kings and archbishops, dukes also and counts, nobles of high rank:
 Under whose rule, Christ-led, all the world will rejoice & prevail,
 And by whom churches will everywhere be increased in number,
 And they will rejoice in new and continuing progeny.¹⁹

*Suggeret omne bonum isti prospera divite censu,
 Illum ditabit, locupletans munificabit;
 Francia deque tuis genitis fecunda beatis,
 Spermate nobelium concretis christocularum,
 Dacigenis cum Francigenis jam pacificatis,
 Gignet producents, expurget, proferet ingens
 Reges, pontificesque, duces, comites, proceresque:
 Sub quibus orbis ovans pollebit, principe Christo,
 Et quibus ecclesiae fecundabuntur utique,
 Atque novo quorum, gaudebunt, perpete foete.*²⁰

The prophecy promises Rollo a new homeland, great success, and that, much like Aeneas, after years of hardship and war, he will found an enduring empire ruled by his descendants. As Ingledew suggests, however, Dudo replaces the pagan elements of the *Aeneid*'s prophecies with Christian ones more consonant with medieval theology and ideology: Rollo becomes a church-builder in his new land.

Dudo asserts the Norman right to rule in two ways. First, by connecting their genealogy to the Trojans, themselves the ancestors of the Romans, he offers the example of *translatio imperii* as imperial primogeniture. This justification, however, lacks the divine sanction so crucial to the medieval understanding of the divine right of medieval kings. This secular justification is, therefore, incomplete, so Dudo, like Virgil, uses prophecy to imbue it with religious legitimacy as well. In *The Aeneid*, Venus, Jupiter, and Vulcan, the pagan gods of Roman religion, all use prophecy to guide Aeneas to Rome and ensure its founding and imperial success, a chain of events made possible by Poseidon's

19 Dudo (1998) 28.

20 Dudo (1865) 144.

prophecy in *The Iliad* (20.302) that Aeneas was destined not to die at Troy, but to carry on the Trojan line. Dudo also employs prophecy to grant his ruler divine sanction, but unlike the pagan gods who prophesy Aeneas' success, Rollo's rule is sanctioned by the Christian God.

Like all genres, the genealogical history has a set of literary conventions; in the world of the conventional genealogical history, no king who receives a prophecy of success ever dies with this prophecy unrealized. The prophecy, therefore, is more than simply divine sanction: it is a guarantee of success. Rollo's story, then justifies the continued reign of his dynasty, a particularly potent concern given that Richard I had only two more years to live when he commissioned Dudo and the political instability of the 990s.²¹

2 The Trojan Genealogical History in England: Geoffrey of Monmouth's *Historia Regnum Britanniae* and the English Civil War

Dudo's historiographical method became the literary model for later medieval historians. Geoffrey of Monmouth's *History of the Kings of Britain* uses this same mix of Trojan wanderings, prophecy, and genealogy to create a national identity for Britons and justify the political legitimacy of its ruling class. Geoffrey's *History* was written during the 1130s, during the English Civil War between the Empress Matilda, whom Henry I had declared his heir on January 1, 1127, and King Stephen, who contested her claim to the throne. His *History* can thus be viewed as criticism of civil war in general and in support of Matilda in particular, especially in light of the fact that "her greatest supporter was Geoffrey's chief patron, the strong and generous Robert of Gloucester."²² Finally, Geoffrey argues for what Tatlock calls "still more crudely, imperialist propaganda."²³ The English sought to justify their long-dreamt of conquests in Ireland as well as the Continent by citing, through their genealogical connection to Troy, a historical claim to the land—both Britain, whom their eponymous ancestor, the Trojan refugee Brutus, ruled, and the rest of Europe, where their imperial forebearers the Romans did:

That the Norman dynasty was addicted to extending its dominions needs no proof ... Nor is proof needed that Geoffrey again and again exalts

²¹ Succinctly described in Lifschitz (1994) 107–109 and 115–117.

²² Tatlock (1938) 702.

²³ Tatlock (1938) 702.

his Britons by showing them again and again as European if not world conquerors ... I do not believe that Geoffrey was unaware that his showing the ruler of England as lord also of all the British Isles, all Scandinavia and most of France, and as victorious over the Roman Empire, would be highly gratifying to the Norman dynasty and its supporters.²⁴

Geoffrey's work, like Dudo's, encompasses several centuries, and, as with Dudo, the Trojan section comprises only the introductory part of his history. Nevertheless, their early sections contain the major themes of the rest of their respective works. Geoffrey begins by sketching out the physical dimensions of the land over which he wishes to justify English rule and the various races of people who live there.²⁵ Having described the kingdom and its current political situation, Geoffrey then describes how the Britons once ruled it before the Norman Conquest. Implicit in his discussion is their right to rule it again, while the rest of his history is an argument for the justness of British rule based on their primacy.

Indeed, after this description of the political sphere, Geoffrey returns to the origins of secular history, the Trojan War, to describe the events leading up to the founding of Britain: "After the Trojan War, Aeneas fled from the ruined city with his son Ascanius and came by boat to Italy"²⁶ (*Aeneas, post Troianum bellum et excidium urbis cum Ascanio, filio suo fugiens, Italio navigio devenit.*²⁷) The events of the *Aeneid* are briefly reiterated, followed by Geoffrey's making explicit a genealogical link to Rome, Ascanius' election as king, and his founding of "the town of Alba on the bank of the Tiber"²⁸ (*Super Tiberim Albam Longam condidit.*²⁹) Having made explicit the genealogical links to Troy and Rome, Geoffrey recasts Dudo's model to describe the founding of Britain. Like Dudo, Geoffrey stresses the importance of prophecy in this case, thereby granting a divine sanction to the events that he describes: Ascanius' son has a love affair with Lavinia's niece. On finding out that she is pregnant, Ascanius consults the soothsayers about the child's destiny:

24 Tatlock (1938) 703. See Zatta 1998 for an alternate reading of the political implications of Geoffrey's vernacular translators.

25 Geoffrey (1951) 23.

26 Geoffrey (1966) 54.

27 Geoffrey (1951) 24.

28 Geoffrey (1966) 54.

29 Geoffrey (1951) 24.

The soothsayers said that she would give birth to a boy, who would cause the death of both his father and mother; and that after he had wandered in exile through many lands, this boy would eventually rise to the highest honour.³⁰

*Dixerunt autem magi ipsam gravidam esse puero qui et patrem et matrem interficeret pluribusque terries in exilium peragratīs ad summum tandem culmen honoris perveniret.*³¹

The child, a royal Trojan refugee destined to rule a new empire in the west, is thus another iteration of the medieval mythical paradigm rooted in Virgil's Aeneas and paralleled in the Middle Ages by Dudo's Rollo. Brutus is expelled from Italy, fleeing over the sea until he meets a group of Trojan refugees who are held in slavery in Greece. In a long battle scene, Brutus, like Aeneas, fights a new Trojan War in which the Trojans defeat the Greeks. Finally—and just as the *Aeneid* itself suggests the union of Trojan and Italian through the marriage of Aeneas's son and Lavinia's niece—Geoffrey recasts the Trojan War's end with Brutus' marriage to the Greek king Pandrasus' daughter Ignoge. At the wedding, Pandrasus readily acknowledges the legitimacy of Brutus' descent:

I take some comfort in the knowledge that I am about to give my daughter to a young man of such great prowess. The nobility which flourishes in him, and his family, which is well known to us, show him to be of the true race of Priam and Anchises.³²

*Solacium tamen habeo, quia copulo eam probo et nobili, quem ex genere Priami et Anchisae creatum fama declarat.*³³

Pandrasus confirms Brutus' lineage in terms of his descent from the Trojans through Priam and the Romans through Anchises. The defeat of the Greeks by the Trojans reverses the historical ignominy of the Trojan War, thereby removing the stigma of defeat from Brutus' British descendants, Geoffrey's patrons. The kings of England are now seen to be on the side of the winners of the Greco-Trojan wars, not the losers.

30 Geoffrey (1966) 54.

31 Geoffrey (1951) 25.

32 Geoffrey (1966) 63.

33 Geoffrey (1951) 32.

Also like his literary models, Brutus receives a divine prophecy for the building of his new nation. After his wedding, Brutus and the Trojans set sail and, during their journey, come across a temple of Diana, where “there was a statue of the goddess which gave answers if by chance it was questioned by anyone.”³⁴ (*Ubi imago eiusdem deae response quaerentibus dabat.*³⁵) Drawing on the prophetic mode of both Virgil and Dudo and breaking from the narrative prose, Brutus asks the goddess in verse to

tell me which lands you wish us to inhabit. Tell me of a safe dwelling-place where I am to where I am to worship you down the ages, and where, to the chanting of maidens, I shall dedicate temples to you.³⁶

*dic quas terras nos habitare velis.
Dic certam sedem, qua te venerabor in aevum,
Qua tibi virgineis templa dicabo choris.*³⁷

The prophecy is then given when Diana comes to him in a dream:

It seemed to him that the goddess stood before him and spoke these words to him: “Brutus, beyond the setting of the sun, past the realms of Gaul, there lies an island in the sea, one occupied by giants. Now it is empty and ready for your folk. Down the years this will prove an abode suited to you and to your people; and for your descendants it will be a second Troy. A race of kings will be born there from your stock and the round circle of the whole earth will be subject to them.”³⁸

*Tunc visum est illi deam astare ante eum et sese sic affari:
Brute, sub occasu solis, trans Gaillicia regna,
insula in Oceano est, undique clausa mari;
insula in Oceano est habitat gigantibus olim,
nunc deserta quidem, gentibus apta tuis.
Hanc pete: namque tibi sedes erit illa perennis:
haec fiet natis altera Troia tuis,*

34 Geoffrey (1966) 64.

35 Geoffrey (1951) 33.

36 Geoffrey (1966) 65.

37 Geoffrey (1955) 33.

38 Geoffrey (1966) 65.

*hic de prole tua reges nascentur et illis
totius mundi subditus orbis erit.*³⁹

The prophecy articulates the genealogical justification for the rule of Britain—"a race of kings will be born there from your stock"—as well as the justification for British military expansion onto the Continent—"the round circle of the whole earth will be subject to them." The use of prophecy in this context gives divine (albeit pagan) sanction to Geoffrey's assertions.

Like Dudo, Geoffrey switches from prose to verse when recounting this prophecy. This divine sanction for dominion over the world is also significant insofar as it bears upon England's conflict with the French. Sailing from Diana's temple, Brutus joins with another band of Trojan refugees led by Corineus, who would later become the eponymous founder of Cornwall, just as Brutus would for Britain. Their combined armies land in Aquitaine and defeat the Gauls in battle. Geoffrey even asserts that Brutus "came to the place which is now called Tours, the city which, as Homer testifies, he himself afterwards founded."⁴⁰ (*venit ad locum ubi nunc est civitas Tournorum, quam, ut Homerus testator, ipse prior construxit.*⁴¹) Geoffrey, who had no access to Homer, could not have known that Homer, in fact, wrote no such thing. Yet by attributing this to Homer, who, because of his age, was held to be a reliable source, Geoffrey seeks to endow the claim with a particularly strong overlay of truth.

He provides further evidence for the primacy of British rule in France later, when he claims that after the death of Brutus' nephew, "[t]he city of Tours ... took its name from Turnus, who was buried there."⁴² (*De nomine itaque ipsius civitas Turonis vocabulum sumpsit, quia ibidem sepultus est Turnus.*⁴³) Places named after Trojan heroes, such as Britain and Cornwall, are one of Geoffrey's methods for asserting political legitimacy over the land to which names refer. Geoffrey here seems to employ this strategy to claim a portion of France for the British.⁴⁴

According to Geoffrey, following this battle Brutus settles in Britain, where he "[comes] at length to the River Thames, walk[s] up and down its banks and

39 Geoffrey (1951) 34.

40 Geoffrey (1966) 69.

41 Geoffrey (1951) 37.

42 Geoffrey (1966) 71.

43 Geoffrey (1951) 38.

44 Geoffrey attributes a similar division of places and eponymous place names to Brutus' sons: "Locrine, who inherited Loegria (England), Albanact, who obtained Albania (Scotland), and Camber, who became king of Cambria (Wales)" Parsons (1929) 394.

so [chooses] a site suited to his purpose. There he build[s] his city and call[s] it Troia Nova."⁴⁵ (*Ad Tamensem fluvium locumque nactus est proposito suo perspicuum. Condidit itaque ibidem civitatem eamque Novam Troiam vocavit, quae postmodum per corruptionem vocabuli Trinovantum est.*⁴⁶) Geoffrey completes his genealogical justification for British rule with this final act of naming: named after Brutus, his companions, and his children, the land becomes the titular property of their descendants.⁴⁷

3 The Trojan War on the Roman Margins: Snorri Sturluson's *Edda* and the Trojans of the Northern Europe

It stands to reason that, as claimants to Rome's inheritance, the French and the English would seek to forge a common genealogical tie to Rome through Troy, but the Trojan War was used as a means to legitimize political authority even in places never under Roman rule. In Iceland, versions of the Trojan War were introduced "before the thirteenth century, creating the mischief it had so often done before. Troy once more had to stand father to a nation looking for a respectable pedigree."⁴⁸ The text which most forcefully makes the connection between the dynasties of Scandinavia is Snorri Sturluson's *Edda*, written around 1220. *The Edda* begins with the Biblical creation story, from Adam and Eve to Noah and the Flood, before linking it to the Trojan legend and, ultimately, through Trojan genealogy, to the line of Scandinavian kings.⁴⁹ Lincoln observes

45 Geoffrey (1966) 73.

46 Geoffrey (1951) 40.

47 For an analysis of Brutus' conquest from a postcolonial perspective, see Warren (1998), esp. 124.

48 Frank (1909) 147.

49 Snorri's other great historiographical work, the *Heimskringla*, begins with a global geography and the rule of Odin, though without the Trojan connection present in the *Edda*. One exception may be his description of the land to the west of the Black Sea, which he notes is called "Europe" by some and "Eneá" by others. Hollander glosses this last word: "From the name of Aeneas, the founder of Lavinium?" Snorri (1964) 6, n. 1. The question mark at the end of the note, however, suggests the speculative nature of the claim. For an analysis of Snorri's knowledge of dynastic and national histories and particularly the works of Geoffrey of Monmouth, see Whaley (1991) 128 and Wanner (2008) 148, who also suggests the Icelandic translation of Dares' *De Excidio Troiae* in Iceland under the title "Trójumanna Saga," which might have also influenced Snorri. The fullest treatment of Snorri's mythological preface is Wanner (2008) 140–158, in which Wanner argues that the purpose of this opening section was "to contrive 'true' portraits of pagan mythological tradition, the ori-

that, in connecting the Trojan legend with the Biblical account of history and other legendary sources, Snorri follows the historiographical method of his predecessors:

His text is an absolute tour de force, combining numerous discourses, allusions, topoi, and subtexts. Among these, one can recognize the Virgilian theme of Trojan origins and migration ... conjoined with a euhe-merist explanation of the pagan deities ... Toward this end he constituted the Norse gods' names as vestigial indices of their native land. Thus, 'Thor' became Trór, a son of Priam named for Troy; his wife 'Sif' was the Sibyl.⁵⁰

Like his predecessors in the historiographical tradition of the Trojan diaspora, Snorri grafts the story of the Trojan diaspora onto the existing tradition of heroic literature (such as the Galfridian combination of the Trojan Brutus with the local traditions of Merlin and Arthur) and, also like Geoffrey, uses the false but plausible etymologies derived from phonetic similarity between place names and Trojan heroes to join the two traditions.

Like Dudo, Snorri begins by describing Troy's central position in world geography:

Near the centre of the world where what we call Turkey lies, was built the most famous of all palaces and halls—Troy by name. That town was built on a much larger scale than others then in existence and in many ways with greater skill, so lavishly was it built.⁵¹

Nær miðri veröldinni var gert þat hús ok herbergi, er ágætast hefir verit, er kallat Trjóa, þar sem vér köllum Tyrkland. Þessi staðr var miklu meiri gerr en aðrir ok með meira hagleik á marga lund með kostnaði ok föngum, en þar váru til.⁵²

Snorri then describes the process of expansion, conquest and colonization by which Trojans spread out and conquered the world: "One of the kings was called Múnón or Memnón. He married a daughter of the chief king Priam who

gins of Scandinavian royalty and culture, and the working out of Christian history in the north" Wanner (2008) 140.

50 Lincoln (2001) 321.

51 Snorri (1964) 25. All Icelandic from Snorri (1935); translation from Snorri (1964).

52 Snorri (1935) 6.

was called Tróan, and they had a son name Trór—we call him Thor.”⁵³ (“Einn konungr í Trjóu er nefndr Múnón eða Mennón. Hann átti dóttur höfuðkonungsins Príamí. Sú hét Tróan. Þau áttu son. Hann hét Trór, er vér köllum Þór.”⁵⁴) Snorri melds the indigenous mythological heroes of Scandinavia, such as Thor, with the imported heroic tradition of Trojan heroes. At the age of twelve, Thor “took possession of the realm of Thrace—we call that Trudheim.”⁵⁵ (“Eignaði sér ríkit Trakía. Þat köllum vér Þrúðheim.”⁵⁶) This is the first of many conquests by the Trojans as they colonize the rest of the world, and it attributes the conquest of a distinctly Balkan location, Thrace, to a distinctly Scandinavian hero, Thor, thus again melding the two traditions.

As with Virgil, Geoffrey, and Dudo, Snorri’s hero benefits from having received a prophecy assuring him of the eventual success of his journey. Each of these heroes, moreover, is assured that his children will rule under the same divine favour as he does. In *The Prose Edda*, Thor, after defeating in battle many warriors, giants and dragons, “married a prophetess called Sibyl.”⁵⁷ (“Í norðrhálfu heims fann hann spákonu þá, er Síbil hét, er vér köllum Sif, ok fekk hennar.”⁵⁸) Their descendant,

Odin, and also his wife, had the gift of prophecy, and by means of this magic art he discovered that his name would be famous in the northern part of the world and honoured above that of all kings. For this reason he decided to set out on a journey from Turkey.⁵⁹

Óðinn hafði spádóm ok svá kona hans, ok af þeim vísendum fann hann þat, at nafn hans myndi uppi vera haft í norðrhálfu heims ok tignat um fram alla konunga. Fyrir þá sök fýstist hann at byrja ferð sína af Tyrklandi.⁶⁰

From this point on, the story leaves Troy, never to return. The literary elements of Snorri’s work and those of his predecessors are the same—a Trojan exile,

53 Snorri (1964) 25.

54 Snorri (1935) 9.

55 Snorri (1964) 25.

56 Snorri (1935) 12.

57 Snorri (1964) 26.

58 Snorri (1935) 13.

59 Snorri (1964) 26.

60 Snorri (1935) 13.

guided by prophecy, becomes progenitor of a European dynasty.⁶¹ But Snorri's version omits a significant element of the traditional story: the Trojan War itself. Like Brutus' and Rollo's flights from Troy, Odin's was the result of fratricide and internecine conflict. Unlike the other two heroes, however, Odin's flight occurs while Priam is still king in Troy; there is no mention of the Greeks or their war against the Trojans. This omission removes the historical stigma of defeat which features prominently in Virgil's and Geoffrey's accounts of Trojan history.

The omission also emphasizes the limited importance in the *Edda* of Troy itself: Snorri's concern is not with Troy or its history; it lies in justifying the political rule of the Yingling and the other northern European dynasties and to set them on equal footing with their Trojan-descended southern European royal peers:

The links forged through Óðinn between the ruling houses of northern and central Europe might have made this scheme even more attractive to [King] Hákon [1v of Norway], who by the early 1220s was keen on fostering relations with neighboring governments ... By placing the *aesir* [that is, the pagan Norse gods] into the stream of Trojan (and thereby world) history at a position of one remove, as it were, from the well-known figures and events of the Trojan war, he may have sought to create a prestigious pedigree for the founders of northern culture and kingship that could not easily be refuted by already established 'history.'⁶²

Indeed, Snorri's account contains the most detailed description of territorial conquest and the establishment of monarchies by the scions of Troy. After reporting the divine sanction for Odin's journey, Snorri then describes Odin and his children's settlements in Northern Europe: Odin and his followers arrive

61 Wanner (2008) 147 argues for an additional kind of genealogical justification for Odin: he not only connects Scandinavian kings to Troy, Rome and European culture, but also "in a quasi-genealogical sense Norwegian kings and Icelandic poets." Thus, the Icelandic poet connects himself, those of his profession, and his race more generally to the ruling elite.

62 Wanner (2008) 149. Wanner further notes, however, that the Trojan theory was not in use before Snorri "and it seems, moreover, never to have gained real purchase in Scandinavia outside of Iceland, where it continued to appear only in texts directly influenced by the *Edda*" Wanner (2008) 149. See Wanner (2008) 149 and following for alternate medieval genealogies of the Scandinavian kings.

and divide the lands up among them. One son, Vegdeg, becomes king of East Germany, another rules over Westphalia, and a third over France. Other sons rule Jutland, Denmark, and Scandinavia. Having colonized for his children much of Northern Europe, Odin himself sets out for Sweden, where, like Brutus and Aeneas before him, he becomes the founder of a New Troy. The urgency of this mission, however, is diminished by the fact that in Snorri's account of history the original Troy still stands. Nor is Odin a fugitive like his father, Aeneas, Rollo, or Brutus. Rather, his "travels were attended by such prosperity that, wherever they stayed in a country, that region enjoyed good harvests and peace."⁶³ ("sá tími fylgði ferð þeira, at hvar sem þeir dvöldust í löndum, þá var þar ár ok friðr."⁶⁴) Indeed, such is his prosperity that when he arrives in Sweden, the local king offers to give him the chief authority in the country. Odin accepts "and he chose there for himself a town-site now called Sigtuna."⁶⁵ ("ok kaus sér þar borgstað, er nú heita Sigtún."⁶⁶)

Sigtun becomes Odin's New Troy; he founds it on the same plan as the original city and institutes in it the same customs and laws which had existed in the old Troy: "He appointed chieftains after the pattern of Troy, establishing twelve rulers to administer the laws of the land, and he drew up a code of law like that which had held in Troy and to which the Trojans had been accustomed."⁶⁷ ("Skipaði hann þar höfðingjum ok í þá líking, sem verit hafði í Trója, setti tólf höfuðmenn í staðinum at dæma landslög, ok svá skipaði hann réttum öllum sem fyrr hafði verit í Trója ok Tyrkir váru vanir."⁶⁸) Finally, Odin

placed his son over the kingdom now called Norway. Their son was called Sæming and, as it says in the *Háleygjatal*, together with the earls and other rulers the kings of Norway trace their genealogies back to him. Odin kept by him the son called Yngvi, who was king of Sweden after him, and from him have come the families known as the Ynglingar.⁶⁹

setti þar son sinn til þess ríkis, er nú heitir Nóregr. Sá er Sæmingr kallaðr, ok telja þar Nóregskonungar sínar ættir til hans ok svá jarlar ok aðrir ríkismenn, svá sem segir í Háleygjatali. En Óðinn hafði með sér þann son

63 Snorri (1964) 27.

64 Snorri (1935) 15.

65 Snorri (1964) 27.

66 Snorri (1935) 15.

67 Snorri (1964) 27.

68 Snorri (1935) 15.

69 Snorri (1964) 27.

sinn, er Yngvi er nefndr, er konungr var í Svíþjóðu eftir hann, ok eru frá honum komnar þær ættir, er Ynglingar eru kallaðir.⁷⁰

Thus are the Trojan origins for most of the dynasties in Northern Europe and Scandinavia established at the outset of Snorri's history, thereby establishing their political legitimacy based on their Trojan pedigree. Snorri, moreover, attributes another legitimizing factor to the government: that it was founded on the same laws as existed in Troy, thus giving not only the monarchy but the social and legal codes the elevated pedigree which comes from Trojan lineage.

4 The Republic of Troy: *The Codex Marco*, Martin da Canal's *Les Estoires de Venise*, and the Trojan Origins of Venice

Like Dudo, Geoffrey, and Snorri, the authors of chronicles about the Trojan founding of Venice use their legendary genealogy to justify the right of the conquerors to possess the land and to use the Trojans.⁷¹ Several works describe the Trojan origins of Venice, of which only two will be discussed here: Martin da Canal's *Estoire de Venise*, composed between 1267 and 1275, and the *Codex Marco*, composed in 1292.⁷² Unlike many of the dynasties that claimed Trojan descent, Venice was not a monarchy, but a republic. As a result, the values embodied by the Trojans in the Venetian foundation story were different from those commissioned by European monarchs. Dudo, Geoffrey, and Snorri conceive of history as being shaped by the agency of one hero whose embodiment of that society's values enables him to lead his people to safety and prosperity. Although the Republic of Venice was certainly an oligarchy, it was also a communal undertaking. As a result, the chroniclers who wrote about Venice's Trojan foundation imbued their work with the communal values the society idealized. The Trojans in *The Codex Marco*, for example, do not come to Venice led by a single hero-founder, but rather as a group:

Then came the Trojans to their ships, they immediately set sail, sailing the seas so long until they came to a hill, where the city of Venice is now

⁷⁰ Snorri (1935) 15.

⁷¹ For general reference, see Pertusi (1970) and Da Canal (1972), which contain both the primary sources and detailed analysis.

⁷² For another work, the 12th century *Origo civitatum Italie seu Venetiarum*, see Brown (1996) 12.

built, and deliberating among themselves about the position of the place, which was marshy and free from all authority, they decided to construct their homes there.⁷³

*Itaque accedentes Troiani ad eorum vassella, dederunt continuo vela ventis, tam diu per equora navigantes quousque pervenerunt ad quandam tubam, ubi nunc venetiarum civitas est constructa, et deliberantes infra se de statione loci, qui erat labilis et ab omni exemptus dominio, disposuerunt ibi ipsorum construere mansiones.*⁷⁴

It is only after the initial group settlement that an elected king (much like a doge) arrives with a second group of settlers consisting of the Trojan hero Antenor and 2,500 other Trojan refugees. The narrative then continues: "They elected a king. For love of him, they built a city which they called Antenorida, the name of which derived from the king" (*Elegerunt in regem. Cuius amore, civitatem qua(m) construxerant Antenoridam, a nomine region derivatam, <apellarunt>*).⁷⁵ Antenor therefore assumes the role of eponymous hero-founder as did Brutus and other similar heroes. His depiction in this role, however, differs significantly from the treatment of similar characters in other genealogical histories. Antenor is not, in fact, the city founder: he arrives after the unnamed masses had already settled the city. His rule, moreover, comes not from divine sanction, but, mirroring the Venetian system for selecting doges, from an election by the people.⁷⁶ Venice's political structure is a collective one, and thus Venetian historians imagine its Trojan founders to have had, like them, a collective structure.

Das interprets this as a rejection of the idealized founder-hero/king of other genealogical histories: Antenor's departure "suggests that even though the Trojans had chosen him to be their king, the conditions were already set, that is the abundance of free and various peoples, did not leave the space required for the proper monarchical authority."⁷⁷ Marco, however, describes how "Trojans from many places came to Antenoridam, but such a great crowd having come, it was not possible to welcome them to the island." (*Troiani ex diversis partibus ad Antenoridam accesserunt sed quidem multitudo maxima illuc perveniens, in*

73 Translation my own.

74 Carile (1970) 121. For another reading of this passage, see Das (2004) 99.

75 Carile (1970) 122.

76 This reading of the passage draws from Das (2004) 101.

77 Das (2004) 101.

*inusla non potuit hospitari.*⁷⁸) Antenor then goes on to found Altilia and Padua, where he dies, while other Trojans then found a variety of other cities. Thus, though Venice may have offered Antenor no political space, it did allow him to become a model of city-founder: by conquering cities around Italy, he becomes the prototype for a rising Venetian empire. This function seems to be the view of his fellow Trojans, as reflected in his epitaph:

Here lies Antenor, founder of the city of Padua.
He was a good man, all followed him.

*Hic iacet Antenor, Paduane conditor urbis.
Vir bonus ille fuit, omnes secuntur eum.*⁷⁹

A similar communal founding is attested in Martin da Canal's *Les Estoires de Venise*. Fleeing from Attila the Hun, the Trojan refugees, who had lived between Milan and Hungary for many years, until Attila the Hun

came to Italy against the Christians ... and first took a noble city called Aquileia and destroyed it: and know that it was first built by the Trojans. And when Attila had spent a season in Aquileia, he set out from there and destroyed all the Trojan cities up to Milan. And because of this destruction, the noblemen and women of these cities took to the sea and found mounds in the sea and on these mounds built many beautiful houses.

vint en Itaire encontre les crestiens ... et prist premierement une noble cite que l'en apele Aulee et la mist a destruction: et sachés que celes Aulee fu estoree premierement por li Troians. Et quant Atille fu en saisine de Aulee, il s'en ala avant e mist a destruction totes les viles que firent li Troians en seche terre jusque a Millan. Et par cele destruction s'enfuïrent la nobilité des homes et des femes de celes viles enver le mer et troverent desor la marine monciaus de terre et firent desor ciaux monciaus de terre maintes beles viles.⁸⁰

78 Carile (1970) 122.

79 Carile (1970) 122.

80 Da Canal (1972) 6.

Da Canal adds that “[t]his beautiful city was called Venice and built in the year of the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ 421.” (“cele bele cite que l’en apele Venise fu faite en l’an de l’incarnation de nostre seignor Jesu Crist .ccccxxj.”⁸¹) While da Canal and Marco both attest to the communal founding (da Canal, in fact, describes the system of republican government and the doges immediately after the establishment of the city) and the flight from the mainland to the marshes, da Canal grounds his account in real rather than legendary history, i.e. the invasion of Attila, and paints his Trojans as Christians, complete with their building of “bele yglises” / “beautiful churches” and, more specifically, “in the main city, 70 churches.” (“en la maistre vile .lxx yglises.”⁸²)

The idealization of group cooperation results in the Venetian accounts leads also to another revision of the traditional conventions of the Trojan foundation myth. Venice, in opposition to Rome, rejects not only the hero-king, but also the guarantee of divine prophecy and empire. Marco’s creation of Venetian ideology is, in this reading, a rejection of Rome.⁸³ The rejection of Antenor is also a rejection of Aeneas-type city founders. Marco gives the Venetians neither a founder “nor does he award them divinely ordained freedom.”⁸⁴ There is no guarantee of prosperity and empire because there is no one family line whose rule the Venetians must ensure. Rather, Marco’s chronicle again stresses communal responsibility. Venice’s security rests upon the cooperation of its citizens, not aid from the gods. Though he drew his account from the same source material and understood the conventions of the Trojan exile as city-founder legend, Marco adapts this type of legend to suit the specific political culture of Venice.⁸⁵

Drawing on Virgil’s example in the *Aeneid*, Dudo, Geoffrey, and Snorri create Trojan exiles who, with divine aid, colonize vast expanses of Europe, both those formerly under Roman control and those, like Scandinavia, which were not. The divinely sanctioned hero-founder who led these expeditions—Aeneas,

81 Da Canal (1972) 6.

82 Da Canal (1972) 6.

83 Brown (1996) 25 notes that in Marco “edged back civic history further than Canal and claimed that the first Trojan colonists had arrived in the Venetian *lagoon* (and not just Aquileia) immediately after the fall of Troy, while Rome would be founded only 454 years later. ... He also addressed the issue of Venice’s priority over Padua, now a troublesome competitor” by noting that it, too, was founded after Venice. Thus, Marco uses history to assert the civic power and hierarchy in his own time.

84 Das (2004) 101.

85 For which, see Das (2004) 102.

Rollo, Brutus, or Odin—would become the founder of a dynasty, and the divine favour cast upon the founder would carry over to his descendants, guaranteeing peace and prosperity. The Venetian myth of Trojan foundation used these same tropes, but altered them to suit the more republican ideology of the Venetian Republic. Rejecting the single-hero founder and the divine guarantee, Venetian chroniclers like Marco and Martin da Canal created a Trojan society where cooperation and shared responsibility are the only guarantees of success and prosperity. In this communal view, there is room neither for the individual hero nor for the ideology he represents.

Though the stories of Trojan origins are not the main focus of these works, their position at the beginnings of these accounts suggests their importance as the point of origin for secular dynastic histories and for establishing the legitimacy of the rulers whose exploits and lives comprise the remainder of the works.

Bibliography

- Albu, Emily (2001) *The Normans in their Histories*. Woodbridge.
- Bouet, Pierre (1990) "Dudon de St-Quentin et Virgile: 'L'Enéide' au service de la cause normande," *Cahiers des Annales Normandie* 23: 215–236.
- Brown, Patrician Fortini (1996) *Venice and Antiquity*. New Haven.
- Carile, Antonio (1970) "Aspetti della cronachista veneziana nei secoli XIII e XIV," in Pertussi, Agostino (ed.) (1970), 75–126.
- Das, Sheila (2004) "The Disappearance of the Trojan Legend in the Historiography of Venice" in Shepard, Alan and Powell, Stephen (eds.) (2004). Toronto, 97–116.
- Dudo of St. Quentin and Christiansen, Eric (trans.) (1998) *History of the Normans*. Rochester.
- Dudo of St. Quentin and Lair, Jules (ed.) (1865) *Historia Normanorum*. Caen.
- Frank, Tenney (1909) "Classical Scholarship in Medieval Iceland," *The American Journal of Philology* 30.2: 139–152.
- Friis-Jensen, Karsten (1995) "Dudo of St. Quentin and Saxo Grammaticus," in Gatti and Degl'Innocenti (1995), 11–28.
- Gatti, Paolo and Degl'Innocenti, Antonella (eds.) (1995) *Dudone di San Quintino*. Trento.
- Geoffrey of Monmouth and Thorpe, Lewis (trans.) (1966) *History of the Kings of Britain*. New York.
- Geoffrey of Monmouth and Hammer, Jacob (ed.) (1951) *Historia Regum Britanniae*. Cambridge, MA.
- Huisman, Gerda (1984) "Notes on the Manuscript Tradition of Dudo of St Quentin's *Gesta Normanorum*," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 6: 122–135.

- Ingledeu, Francis (1994) "The Book of Troy and the Genealogical Construction of History: The Case of Geoffrey of Monmouths *Historia regum Britanniae*," *Speculum* 69.3: 665–704.
- Kendrick, T.D. (1950) *British Antiquity*. London.
- Lifschitz, Felice (1994) "Dudo's Historical Narrative and the Norman Succession of 996," *Journal of Medieval History* 20: 101–120.
- Martin Da Canal and Limentani, Alberto (ed.) (1972) *Les Estoires de Venise*. Florence.
- Mortensen, Lars Boje (1995) "Stylistic Choice in a Reborn Genre," in Gatti and Degl'Innocenti (1995). Trento.
- Parsons, A.E. (1929) "The Trojan Legend in England: Some Instance of Its Application to the Politics of its Times," *The Modern Language Review* 24.4: 394–408.
- Pertussi, Agostino (ed.) (1970) *La Storiografica Veneziana Fino al Secolo XVI: Aspetti e Problemi*. Florence.
- Reynolds, Susan (1983) "Medieval *Origines Gentium* and the Community of the Realm," *History* 68: 375–390.
- Searle, Eleanor (1984) "Fact and Pattern in Heroic History: Dudo of Saint-Quentin," *Viator* 15: 119–137.
- Shepard, Alan, and Powell, Stephen (eds.) (2004) *Fantasies of Troy: Classical Tales and the Social Imaginary in Medieval and Early Modern Europe*. Toronto.
- Spiegel, Gabrielle (1997) *The Past as Text*. Baltimore.
- Stok, Fabio (1999) "L'Eneide nordica di Dudone di San Quintino," *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 6.2: 171–184.
- Snorri Sturluson and Young, Jean (trans.) (1966) *The Prose Edda*. Berkeley.
- Snorri Sturluson and Jónsson, Guðni (trans.) (1935) *Edda Snorra Sturlusonar med Skáldatali*. Reykjavik.
- Snorri Sturluson and Hollander, Lee (trans.) (1964) *Heimskringla*. Austin.
- Tatlock, J.S.P. (1938) "Geoffrey of Monmouth's Motives for Writing his 'Historia,'" *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 79.4: 695–703.
- Van Houts, Elisabeth (1992) *Gesta Normannorum Ducum of William of Jumièges, Orderic Vitalis, and Robert of Torigni*. Oxford.
- Van Houts, Elisabeth (1984) "Scandinavian Influence in Norman Literature of the Eleventh Century," *Anglo-Norman Studies* 6: 107–121.
- Wanner, Kevin (2008) *Snorri Sturluson and the Edda: The Conversion of Cultural Capital in Medieval Scandinavia*. Toronto.
- Warren, Michelle (1998) "Making Contact: Postcolonial Perspectives through Geoffrey of Monmouth's 'Historia regnum Britannie,'" *Arthuriana* 8.4: 115–134.
- Zatta, Jane (1998) "Translating the 'Historia': The Ideological Transformation 'Historia regnum Britannie' in Twelfth-Century Vernacular Chronicles," *Arthuriana* 8.4: 148–161.

Epic Continuation as Basis for Moral Education: The *Télémaque* of Fénelon

Jardar Lohne

For you, oh my dear Télémaque,
I [Narbal] beg the Gods
who guide you as by the hand,
to accord you the most precious of theirs gifts,
which is virtue pure and without spots,
until death



In 1699, there appeared on the streets of Paris a text of a hitherto unknown nature, apparently by mistake. It was to become a literary sensation, the most sold book in France from its publication until Rousseau's *Julie, ou la nouvelle Heloise* (1761), and make a deep imprint on literary practice at least until the Revolution of 1789, remaining extremely widely read just up until the first world war. According to legend—the sources here are quite ambiguous on the subject of the actual order of things—the mistake lying behind this awesome success lies at the hand of a copyist, passing the text to a printer without permission. The author, François de Salignac de la Mothe-Fénelon (1651–1715), Archbishop of Cambrai and educator of the royal prince, however, had originally composed it solely for an audience of one, notably the young prince of Burgundy, for whom he was the preceptor.

The *Adventures of Télémaque, fils d'Ulysse* (1699), hereafter *Télémaque*, stage the follow-up of the first four books of the *Odyssey* that introduce the story of Ulysses' return to Ithaca in Homer's work. Constituting eighteen separate books, the 17th century epic develops on the original story by following the young prince Télémaque, heir to the throne of Ithaca, across the dangerous and shifting Mediterranean seas on his quest to find his father Ulysses returning from the war of Troy. In Fénelon's version, the young prince's journey becomes one of *education*, preparing him for the royal duties to come. Throughout the text, we follow the young prince at his travels throughout the seas and shore-side communities. Athena, the goddess of wisdom, accompanies him

in disguise as the advisor Mentor, who teaches the young prince to become a virtuous man through moral lessons obtained by the mastery of difficult and changing situations. Under the supervision of Mentor, and subject to the attentions and intrigues of all the Olympian gods, Télémaque is exposed to the dangers of life. Scene by scene, we the readers watch him grow gradually more responsible and mature as he meets and masters ever-varying challenges.

It has been suggested that it is the optimism recognised in the young man's development towards actual moral maturity that fuelled the enthusiasm for the text throughout the 18th century, when it became the most read text of the age. The publication was followed by a wide array of imitations and commentaries throughout Europe, not least found in the work of Rousseau himself. But what was the frenzy really about? The text, copious in literary substance and written as part of the educational scheme of the young prince heir to the French throne, has found several interpretations. Of particular interest concerning the question of why Fénelon resorts to a classical, epic narrative universe in order to elaborate his *miroir de prince*, we can identify three major trends in the reception.¹

Firstly, the choice of an epic style, closely based on the ancient sources, is identified as founded on *political* grounds. A *miroir de prince* is by nature normative, and the political convictions of the preceptor can very easily (at least in the case of Fénelon) be considered to be opposite to the common practice of the reigning prince Louis XIV. As a consequence, the numerous descriptions of often ill-represented and unwise public officials appearing in the work has been considered to point to identified political figures in contemporary France. The use of the epic can thus be understood as a means to conceal the true implications of each critique under the veil of antiquity.

Secondly, the epic style of the oeuvre can be considered out of consideration of aesthetics and/or pride. The French 17th century, furiously occupied with all models from antiquity, struggled to find a form according to which the epic genre could be treated in a manner appropriate to the interpretation of classicism reigning within the early modern French context. According to such a perspective, the *Télémaque* corresponds in effect to the quest for epic, thereby giving it the intended prestige.

Thirdly, and in our opinion most interestingly, the oeuvre can be considered according to what impact it was intended to make on the designated reader (the prince de Bourgogne). Considering the textual evidence, a rather clear

1 For a more general exposé of the reception of the oeuvre, see Hillenaar (2000).

hint can be perceived in the insistence on the development of the *virtue* of the young prince in the literary text. In light of 17th century philosophical and theological debates, however, the questions of how to acquire dispositions such as virtue prove highly problematic. In light of the conceptual problems such questions entail, it appears reasonable to treat the successful development of the virtue of the young prince as both proving the fact that moral development is possible and that the oeuvre can serve as an illustration of how to achieve actual moral development.

The *Télémaque* as Illustration of Actual Moral Development

The *Télémaque* is a story inspired by classic epic writing, centred round the coming of age of the young son of Ulysses. Forming a continuation to the *Odyssey*, the *Télémaque* develops the road to maturity for the fictional prince, proposing by this an example to follow for the young prince of France. One of the most striking characteristics of the text is how the reader can observe the process towards maturity as expressed in the transformation of the prince from being a rebellious boy to a prime example of virtue over the pages of the book.

It is no novelty that the writings conceived for the education of young princes in early modern Europe were conceived in order to develop the moral sense of the readers: already Ronsard, writing in 1561, proclaimed that “a king without virtue carries the sceptre in vain; it is to him nothing but a burden”.² What is strikingly novel about the *Télémaque* is the *form* of the text, treating the question of virtue in a purely literary work on the basis of an epic structure. In fact, with this literary chef d’oeuvre, the “accomplishment of classic writing” in the words of Berlan, incorporate and transform ancient themes and literary structures, thereby prefiguring the future modern novel as it arose during the 18th century.³ The manner of treating moral questions in the *Télémaque* inspired writers and readers of the entire following century, making it, as Rouvillois proclaims, the “apsis of 18th century literature”.⁴

2 Ronsard (1994) 1006.

3 Berlan (1995) 9.

4 Rouvillois (1998) 154.

How Can We Explain the Impact of the *Télémaque*?

As the title indicates, a certain esprit of adventure orients the text. The adventures of the young prince serve in fact as the pivot of the action. Evaluative and discursive passages scandal the text, it is true (and in this, the *Télémaque* constitutes the veritable starting point of much of 18th century literary fiction, at least until the late novels of the Marquis de Sade); however, even in these passages devoted to analysis, the protagonists constantly tell each other their achievements and adventures. These are explicitly used as sources of inspiration, praise or blame.

According to Jacques le Brun, “the number of different editions [of the *Télémaque*], luxurious or popular, reprints, translations into all languages, even the most exotic, surpass”, since its publication in 1699, “clearly one thousand, to the point where no exhaustive bibliography has been established”.⁵ To this startling success we can add the number of works written with the *Télémaque* as model. To quote Henri Coulet, “the *Télémaque* is also at the origin of several didactic novels, such as *Les aventures de Néptolème* by Chansierges (1718), *Les voyages de Cyrus* by Ramsay (1727), *Sethos* by the Abbé Terrasson (1731), *Les repos de Cyrus* by the Abbé Perneti (1732), *Le voyage du jeune Anacharsis* by the Abbé Barthélemy (1788), to which one can even add the *Emile* of Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1762)”.⁶ And, after the research of Erik Leborgne, we can equally add the Slovak adaptation *Les aventures et expériences du jeune René*, that Bajza published in Böhmen in 1785. Leborgne goes so far as to compare the influence of the *Télémaque*, “as much concerning the aesthetic as the ideological level”, with that of *Don Quichote*.⁷ To what can this immense success and following be due?

Expressing the Weakness of the Human Spirit

One striking feature of the work is what problems are investigated and in what manner. The 17th century witnessed a flourishing of rationalist systems aimed at explaining human existence solely on the basis of the cerebral capacity of man. Descartes, but even more Spinoza, Malebranche and Leibniz aspired to deduce ethical systems based on premises thought as indisputable, in trea-

⁵ Le Brun (1995) 7.

⁶ Coulet (1991) 300.

⁷ Leborgne (1997) 949.

tises characterized by a elevated level of abstraction. Fénelon himself did not back down from the exercise of composing learned treatises, from his *Réfutation du système du père Malebranche* to the *Démonstration de l'existence de Dieu* (Oeuvres vol. 1, 1987), and this propensity followed him throughout the whole of his career. What is of interest in this context, however, is the timidity with which he describes the foundations of the morality of man within these textual practices. The main argument for Fénelon in these writings of a purely theoretical nature is that the truths of the faith—i.e. that which constitute the true basement of morality—impose themselves as *mysteries*. Their final reason is in fact not accessible to men, it is beyond the limits of their powers of reasoning.

The *Télémaque* can thus be read as a response to the shortcomings of seventeenth century rationalist moral philosophy. Rationalist philosophers claimed that the order of the world could be deduced from *primary* or *simple* sentences. From these, philosophical systems were constructed in which moral questions appear as the highly abstract end of philosophical thought. The problem with this procedure is twofold. First, it results in a moral philosophy too abstract to be understood by those other than highly trained philosophers. Second, the philosophy resulting from the process is too static and insufficiently precise to be convincing in the chaotic and changeable world of man. The commercial success of *Télémaque* can be viewed as proof of the fruitfulness of Fénelon's reply to the rationalist philosophers.

In acknowledging this incapacity, however, how ought that man be envisaged who can incorporate virtue? If one cannot come to understand on what basic principles virtue is to be erected, how can one envisage moral development? The inability to arrive at a final explanation of the metaphysical groundwork of morality leads, it would seem, to a fundamental pessimism on the subject of moral development. The *Télémaque*, however, expresses a quite different, positive reality.

A striking feature of the *Télémaque* is the transformation of the young prince throughout the work, from being a fiery, short-tempered youngster, into a wise young man, comporting all the features of the virtue hailed in the text. This leads us to consider the work as mainly one of moral development. The prevailing concept within the register of ethics in the *Télémaque* is without a doubt the concept of virtue.

The main idea we propose here is that the moral thought of the archbishop finds a more satisfactory outcome in the literary chef-d'oeuvre. In the *Télémaque*, he can describe his moral optimism, while acknowledging the limits of the reasoning powers of man. The moral principles as exposed within the *Télémaque*, in effect, prove to be, if not imprecise, at least semantically underdetermined and to some degree supple. It seems, in fact, that this sup-

pleness is introduced in order that the moral thought can be adapted to the complex living-world of man. Without succumbing to the temptation to establish a substitute ontology, Fénelon, as he exposes his moral thought through the *Télémaque*, thinks and writes for men embarked in this empirical world, where moral principles manifest themselves in their concrete realizations. In this manner, Fénelon links ethical reflection and actual moral practice.

In contrast to the rationalists' abstract conceptions of the world, Fénelon seeks something that Bakhtin has formulated as "a certain semantic open-endedness, a living contact with unfinished, still-evolving contemporary reality".⁸ Semantic open-endedness is not to be confused with a negation of the concept of truth; rather, it signifies a simpler and more flexible concept of truth than that maintained by the rationalists.

Let us illustrate the use of the word "passion" in different textual contexts, as a strategy to alter or diversify its semantic content—that is, how it can become what Bakhtin calls semantically open-ended—and how this is realized at the level of words. The main idea behind this operation is that such openness creates the possibility of liberating moral thought from the rigidity of abstract principles by bringing it closer to the human world of living. The liberating of morals from the hyperabstraction of rationalist philosophy also implies the possibility of transmitting knowledge of morals, and this is perhaps the most important aspect of Fénelon's work. *Télémaque*, let us not forget, was written with the moral education of a young prince as its main objective. For the future of the state, it was essential that this education be effective, and it is this directly pedagogical aim that ensures Fénelon's focus on viable moral lessons. The idea of loosening the rigid conceptualism of rationalist moral philosophy thereby implies a possibility of transmitting moral thought that makes it possible to act morally. Man's living world is not made for action along abstract principles, and moral thought must correspond to this.

A problem arises here, however, due to the fact that an open-ended moral discourse will not have clear criteria to distinguish between what is morally acceptable, and what is not. A loosening of the rigidity of rationalist systems implies renouncing the idea that the last cornerstone of moral thought stands on clearly defined and solid grounds. But how can one imagine moral thought without a firm cornerstone? It seems that such a moral system is better taught in a narrative language than in the abstract language of academic philosophy. The presentation of a virtue-based scheme like the one present in *Télémaque* is necessarily open-ended, in the sense that the concept of moral truth that

8 Bakhtin (1981) 7.

is present in the text is not absolute. War is wrong, says Mentor. But, he adds, sometimes you have to go to war, and then you should be brave. Moral judgement in the world of human life is always related to situations, and therefore a total *a priori* moral knowledge cannot be conveyed. *Télémaque* does not construct a finite, perfect moral system; it does *point*, however, to the fact that moral education *is* possible in the world.

We address this question specifically by showing how the word “passion” is used in a multitude of ways in the text, some of which contradict one another. As we shall see, this word is the key to the moral education Fénelon is seeking; the reasons for why passion is best judged, and knowledge of its effects best transmitted, in a narrative text lie in the very definition of the word.

What is Passion?

According to commonplace definition in the seventeenth century, passion is described as strong and barely controllable emotion.⁹ This also implies that it is a threat to reason as the basis of decision and judgement. Passion is therefore best understood as the problem to which virtue is an answer, as virtue seeks to let reason govern. Passion is the victory of the present, the enthusiasm of the moment. In this sense passion is the extreme expression of the temporal as the negation of the eternal. Passion thereby becomes a moral problem: the passionate person acts in defiance of eternity (God) as the reason and basis of action.

9 See for instance the definition in the *Dictionnaire de L'Academie Française* (1694), which defines passion as a “movement of the soul excited in its concupiscent or irascible part” and follows with a list of examples showing its association with fury, blindness, destabilising or enslaving nature, and its association with oratory and poetry: “Passion [*Patir*]. Passion. s. f. Mouvement de l'ame excité dans la partie concupiscible, ou dans la partie irascible. *Grande passion, forte passion, passion violente, passion vehemente, ardente, dereglee, furieuse, aveugle, estre maistre de ses passions, la passion l'emporte, la passion l'aveugle, se laisser aller, se laisser emporter à ses passions, il est esclave de ses passions, dompter, reprimer, moderer ses passions, calmer ses passions, commander à ses passions, il est bien sujet à ses passions, n'escoutez pas vostre passion, dans la violence de sa passion, l'amour est la passion predominante des jeunes gens, est leur passion dominante, quand la passion se ralentit, cet homme n'est pas croyable, il en parle avec passion, il fait tout par passion, je vous en parle sans passion, cet Orateur excite les passions, esmeut les passions, remue les passions, La pitié & la terreur sont les passions que la Tragedie se propose d'exciter*”.

The Circles of Passion and Virtue

The points of departure for Fénelon's moral thought are two closed circles, the first of which is the circle of passion. Passionate character entails for Fénelon the incapacity to visualize what is good in a situation, and the inability to see what is good entails the inability to do good. Doing what is not good degrades the character, and in turn the degraded character cannot see what is good. The circle of passion thus ensures that he who is passionate remains passionate. The most prominent example of this logic in the text is the description of the king trapped by his passions:

The most unhappy of all Men is a King, who thinks himself happy when he makes all the rest of Mankind miserable. His Blindness doubles his Unhappiness; for not knowing his Misery, he cannot apply Remedies to it; nay; he is afraid to know it: Truth cannot pierce thro' the Crowd of his Flatterers to reach him; his *Passions* tyrannize him.¹⁰

The evil king is trapped in his passionate world, and cannot escape it as he is not free to choose in morally challenging situations. A passionate person cannot be *free* in any plausible understanding of the word. He who is passionate is passionate, and lets his passions govern:

This Man seems to do whatever he pleases; whereas it is not so: For he does whatever his [ferocious] *Passions* please; he is continually forc'd away wherever his Avarice or Suspicions drag him: He seems to be Master of all other Men, but he is not Master of himself; for he has as many Masters and Tormentors as he has inordinate Desires.

We can thus see how the circle of passion is constructed. It is a downwards spiral, and he who is trapped is unable to get out of it again, at least not by his own means. Correspondingly, the other circle that defines Fénelon's moral thought, the circle of virtue, is also a closed circle.

Virtuous character has the capacity to distinguish what is good, to do good and thereby strengthen the virtuous character. That is to say that he who is virtuous is to become more virtuous, and perfectly moral people (men only) do not have to strive to remain within their closed universe:

¹⁰ All extracts from the text are taken from the 1972 facsimile reprint of the 1720 English-language edition.

Their long Experience of Men and Mannors, and their unweary' d Application to study; furnish' d them with vast extensive Views in all Things. But what most contributed to maturate their Reason, was the Tranquillity of their Minds—Free'd from the wild caprices and *Passions* of Youth, they were actuated by Wisdom alone, and the Result of their long try' d Virtue was so perfect a Matter over their Humours, that without any Uneasiness they enjoy'd the charming and noble Delight of being ruled by Reason.

He who has risen to the highest level of virtue is no longer subject to passions; the circle of virtue has assured his virtuous being. Such figures, however, are only wise men, not kings, judges, nor rulers. This is seemingly the greatest possible display of virtue; however, the end of the circle of virtue is the abolition of the need for virtue in the sense that virtue is a firm attitude to morally complex situations and a firm attitude implies that there is a choice between different options. God, or the godlike, does not have to choose between different options in morally challenging situations since the godlike already knows what to do.

One thus arrives at the familiar paradox, that God, or he who is godlike, cannot be virtuous. Both of these circles are closed, in the sense that one is never really free to do what one wants to do. Both are also described as elaborated, or transformed, through the meeting with the complexity of the lived world. If moral thought based on virtue is to be effective, however, these circles need to be loosened. In the following, we shall see how Fénelon opens the two circles, and in so doing opens towards a viable practical morality. *Télémaque* will have to fight against his passions, and in this struggle, his virtue is his weapon. The definition of a practical ethic constructed so that it accords with the fact that the world is an ever-changing and disparate conglomerate of situations is, according to my reading, impossible for Fénelon. He needs some sort of unifying moral principle and moral guidelines for the world. It is these guidelines, or more precisely, the ontological foundation for them, I claim, which Fénelon cannot express directly. The perfect moral system must define the essence of the God of whose will it is an expression. This is exactly what the rationalist philosophers claimed to be possible, and it is to this claim that Fénelon's text reacts. As we shall see, the multifarious use of the word "passion" shows how Fénelon's text enters into dialogue with the idea of a perfect ethical principle that will always remain partly obscure to man. We must bear in mind that with *Télémaque* Fénelon does not aim to create a saint; he wants to form a king who acts in the world of human life.

Re-evaluating the Passions

It is interesting that Fénelon not only seeks to teach the young prince how to master his passions and replace them with acts of reason. Somewhat surprisingly, we learn throughout the text that passions are not only negative to a man that is to become a king, but they are also in fact essential to his being. It is impossible to exist without passion; that is to say, it is impossible to exist in the world without passions. Existence without passion is reserved for those who distance themselves from the world and the consciousness of being in the world. Fénelon's essay to re-evaluate the passions is therefore to be read as an essay to reintroduce moral thought into the human, living world. If there were no passions, life would not exist, which is to say, man cannot be considered *sub specie aeternitatis*.

When we turn to the text, we can distinguish two conflicting objectives: on the one hand, there is the ambition to guide the young prince into the circle of virtue, and on the other, perhaps more important, the emphasis that no man is perfect. These two conflicting views stand alongside one another, and allow us to understand that the perfectly good is for the godlike. Man must seek to conquer his passions, and so become virtuous.

A King, let him be ever so good and wise, is still a Man. His Knowledge [*esprit*] has Limits, and his Virtue is not infinite. He is subject to Humour, *Passion*, Habit, which it is impossible he should be absolute Master of. He is besieged by cunning self-interested People. He cannot find the Assistance he wants. He every Day falls into Misreckoning, sometimes thro' his own *Passions*, and sometimes thro' those of his Ministers. Scarce has he repair'd one fault, but he runs into another: such is the Condition of the most intelligent and most virtuous Kings.

Mentor is not teaching Télémaque to be a moral saint. He is thought to be a virtuous man, and acknowledges that if he is to live in the world, he has to accept that he is subject to the passions. Let us now focus on the question of how literary form differs from philosophy in communicating these values.

Positive Passions

Passions are positive. Passions are negative. How can the overt antinomies in these claims be unified? Only, we maintain, through a narrative text. This is due to the narrative's ability to say both yes and no to the same phenomena, letting

it depend on situations, and thereby creating a semantic open-endedness, what Bakhtin calls the dialogical word. Narrative texts, here understood as contrary to philosophical texts, can create the kind of openness necessary for dialogue. Unlike the philosophical text, the narrative does not have the same need to say explicitly what is right and what is wrong. Philosophy, as we see it in the treatises of the French seventeenth century rationalists, moves from questions or initial remarks to answers. Philosophy refers in this sense to a totally ideal world. However, as Fénelon so insistently observes, the world is made out of flesh and bone, not out of philosophical abstractions. On a more ontological level, the world as contemplated philosophically is static in the sense that the same premises will always produce the same result.

The philosophical word, then, regards the world from a distance, from above, taking a godlike perspective. It is this perspective whose possibility Fénelon seems to deny. On the other hand, we have the narrative word. The narrated word is *in* the world, among the people; not abstraction, but flesh and blood. Here it is more important for us to point out the implications of the situations present in a novel at an ontological level. The presence of these situations in a novel allows for a far more complex understanding of what it is to be a human being in the living world. This again gives us a possibility to see the figure behind the narrated morals in the *Télémaque*.

The narrative word does not *explain* what is right or wrong, it *shows*, or *points out*. Accepting that the human, living world is too complex to be described adequately by abstract thought, Fénelon's text seems to accept that the only truly efficient moral theory is a practical one. Thus, the text responds to the old demand that literature should *plaire et instruire*, please and instruct.

We now see that the condition of man as a necessarily passionate creature is evaluated positively:

None of them hardly dared breath, for fear of breaking in upon the profound Silence, and so losing something of the divine Musick, still fearing least it would be too soon over. Mentors voice was by no means effeminate, but tuneable, strong and expressive of every *Passion* he turn'd it to.

This positive evaluation is linked also to the striving for glory, as when Télémaque is praised for his "laudable passion for glory", or Fénelon speaks of the training of youth: "they were thus contriving to keep the Youth chaste, innocent, laborious, docile and passionate for Glory". It appears also in the people's love for their leader: "Timocrate expos'd himself to very imminent Dangers, by attempting to destroy that Chieftain, antidst an Army that so *passionately* lov'd him."

Passions, then, can be of positive value. The fact still remains, however, that the liberation of oneself from the passions is the most important task of the moral education. We can further recognize the ambivalence of Fénelon's attitude towards the passions in the different positions expressed by Mentor towards Télémaque. In the first quotation, exposure to passion is good, because the experience of the passions implies understanding of what they are and what they can do:

O son of the wise Ulysses, whom the Gods have so much lov' d and whom they still love; 'tis that very Love makes them expose you to such terrible Evils: He that has not been made sensible of his Weakness and the violence of his *Passions*, can never be call'd wise; for he is still unacquainted with his own Heart and knows not how to be dissident of himself: The Gods have led you as it were by the Hand to the very Brink of a Precipice, to show you the Downfall of it, without letting you drop into it; now therefore conceive what you could never have conceiv' d, if you had not made a Tryal of it your self.

On the other hand, the experience of passion creates traces in the brain of the subject of the passion which are impossible to expunge:

I am much pleas'd, O Son of Ulysses, To see in you so laudable a *Passion* for Glory, 'tis true, all you see here is good and laudable; but know, that it is possible to do yet better Things than these. Idomeneus curbs his *Passions*, and applies himself to regulate his People; yet for all this, he commits a great many Faults, which are the unhappy Consequences of his ancient Errors: When Men set about shaking off any evil Custom, this Evil still seems to follow them; there still remains within them some of their old Leaven, a weaken'd Disposition, inveterate Errors, and almost incurable Prejudices. Happy are they who never wander' d out of the right Path! They may be able to do good in a much greater Perfection. The Gods, O Telemachus, will expect more from you than from Idiomeneus; because you have been acquainted with the Truth from your Infancy upwards, and have never been abandon' d to the Fascinations of a too great Prosperity.

There is then no final answer to the questions of moral evaluation of the concept of passion. Rather, the text shows us multiple uses and the diverse judgements that can be attributed to it. The text of Fénelon questions the very foundations of morals by its multiple and context dependent use of moral concepts.

Conclusion

God is infinite and man is finite. Our finite knowledge can never extend to full appreciation of God's nature, and a morality based in duty demands that we live according to principles given us by the will of a supreme lawmaker. Due to the disproportion between its infinite character and our finitude, however, it is impossible for man to grasp fully the will of this lawmaker and it is on these grounds that Fénelon rejects a duty based morality. Nevertheless, in order to act morally we do have to act so as to reach a comprehension of this will, and the development of virtue in the universe of Fénelon aims at a better vision of the divine will. The genre that aims to better the reader's moral vision must be able to convey moral lessons, teaching the reader to act in accordance with the divine will, while at the same time admitting that this will cannot be known fully. I shall argue that the development of such conceptions of virtue, open-ended as they are, is best realized through a narrative text. We then might reformulate our question thus: in accepting that virtue-based moral schemes are semantically open, that is to say in admitting that moral good in the world of human life is dependent on context, how might one learn to distinguish between what is morally good behaviour and what is not? And how can one learn to live thereafter by these schemes? It seems in fact that such moral thought and education is genre-dependent, and realizable through storytelling and the use of narrative language. The idea pursued here is that the text can be considered as a moral dialogue, between the moral writer and the world resistant to moral abstraction, between the need for clear boundaries that distinguish what is good and what is not, and a moral virtue that cannot define this boundary unequivocally. The different conceptions and evaluations of the notion 'passion' in Fénelon's text reflect, I have argued, a dialogue which depends on what Bakhtin calls a semantic open ended-ness of the notion in discussion. The idea pursued here is that the moral language of Fénelon's text is a language in dialogue. With what is it in dialogue? We have argued that the context-dependent character of Mentor's moral lessons *points* to a certain universal principle not visible for man. However, through acts of virtue one might approach this eternal truth and thus its meaning in terms of situations. Fénelon's text is a text in dialogue with a principle with which it cannot discourse openly, making it an open-ended dialogue with only one speaker. The very semantic openness of the notion "passion" is what opens up a dialogue with this perfect morality. The narrative language of *Télémaque* in this way creates possibilities for a moral discourse distinct from that of speculative philosophy.

Bibliography

- Bakhtin, M. (1981) "Epic and Novel" in *The Dialogic Imagination—four essays*, University of Texas Press, Austin.
- Berlan, F. (1995) "Lexique et affects dans le *Télémaque*: la distance et l'effusion" in *Littératures classiques*, n° 23, Klincksieck, Paris, Janvier.
- Coulet, H. (1991 [1967]) *Le roman jusqu'à la Révolution*, huitième édition, Armand Colin, Paris.
- Fénelon, F. (1979) *The Adventures of Telemachus*, facs. reprint of the 1720 edition printed for E. Currl and J. Pemberton, Garland Publishing, New York and London.
- Fénelon, F. (1987) *Œuvres I*, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, Éd. Gallimard, Paris.
- Hillenaar, H. (ed.) (2000) *Nouvel état présent des travaux sur Fénelon*, Éd. Rodopi, Amsterdam-Atlanta.
- Leborgne, E. (1997) "Roman" in *Dictionnaire européen des Lumières*, sous la direction de Delon, Michel, Presses Universitaires de France, Paris.
- Le Brun, J. (1995) "Préface" in *Les Aventures de Télémaque*, Folio Classique, Éditions Gallimard, Paris.
- Ronsard, P. (1994) *Institution pour l'Adolescence du Roy très-chrétien Charles IX de ce nom* in *Œuvres*, Bibliothèque de la Pléiade, Gallimard, Paris.
- Rouvillois, F. (1998) *L'utopie—textes choisis et présentés*, collection "Corpus", GF Flammarion, Paris.

Nikos Kazantzakis' *Odysseia*: The Epic Sequel in Modern Greek Poetry and Classical Reception

Martha Klironomos

To the contemporary reader, Book 22 of Homer's *Odyssey* presents the mechanisms of violence. Odysseus has just returned to Ithaka after a ten-year absence. He has witnessed the overriding lawlessness that has plagued his house and decides to take action. His only recourse in restoring order and authority is to render punishment by death and destruction. He takes up his armour, and with the help of Telemachus, slaughters Penelope's unruly suitors, whose many transgressions remained unchecked during the course of his journey home from the Trojan war. The details of the slaughter are presented in graphic detail. There is reference to the weaponry used, the way in which the victims are killed, the profusion of blood. Eurykleia, Odysseus' nurse, beholds the sullied remains—corpses piled on top of each other amid the filth and pools of blood. As she perceives the gore, Odysseus is “awful” (“δεινός”) to look upon (Homer, *Od.* 22.405).¹

Nikos Kazantzakis begins the *Odysseia* (1938) precisely at the point at which Odysseus has slaughtered the transgressors. Drawing on Book 22 of Homer's *Odyssey*, the opening lines of Canto 1 are tempered with visual traces of the excessive force Odysseus has wrought to exact justice. Odysseus has hung up his bow after murdering the errant youths and proceeds to the baths to cleanse himself of his bloody rampage. The sequel's² action begins mid-sentence to denote Kazantzakis' stark narrative intervention:

And when in his broad courtyards he had struck down the unruly youths

1 All translations from the original Greek are mine unless otherwise indicated.

Key to Abbreviations:

K, OMS: Kazantzakis' *The Odyssey: A Modern Sequel* (1958)

K, O: Kazantzakis' *Odysseia* (1938)

SL: *Selected Letters of Nikos Kazantzakis*.

2 Kimon Friar's translation, *The Odyssey: A Modern Sequel* (1958), was instrumental in interpreting the *Odysseia* as a “sequel.” Kazantzakis worked closely with Friar, a renowned translator and literary scholar, to translate this work into English. Friar replicates Kazantzakis' seventeen-syllable iambic into a twelve beat iambic in English.

Odysseus hung high his sated³ bow and walked towards the warm baths
to cleanse his enormous body.

Two slavewomen were drawing the water, but when they saw their
master

they screamed, for his belly and loins steamed
and thick black blood dripped from both of his palms;

...

K, O, 1.74–79

In Kazantzakis' eclectic revision, however, he formulates a sequel in which Odysseus decisively flees his homeland after he restores civic order. He embarks on a new journey to lands outside the boundaries of Helladic space—from the Mediterranean to the far reaches of Africa and the Antarctic. Kazantzakis adapts the Homeric text to graft his philosophical exploration of the limits of human consciousness in an episodic meandering through a number of conceptual paradigms drawn from Eastern and Western thought. The *Odysseia* is based on the presumption of the enlightened mission of poetry that looks upon Homeric epic as a foundational text to ground its philosophical ideas. In integrating elements of epic into the poetic narrative, the *Odysseia* transcends historical time through the symbolic realm of the aesthetic. It resonates with poetry of the Romantic era, rather than the Modernist, in deeming poetry as a place of reconciliation in which to situate the spiritual quest for freedom.⁴

We see Kazantzakis' bold interventions in every aspect of his revision. The last two books of Homer's epic are excised. The poem's 24 cantos, consisting of 33,333 lines, present a modernized version of epic form. It is written in a radicalized linguistic register: a simplification of the Modern Greek vernacular,⁵ yet rich in its use of regional words. Instead of replicating the Homeric hexameter, or even adopting Modern Greek folk poetry's traditional fifteen-syllable line, Kazantzakis formulates a seventeen-syllable iambic.⁶ In justifying the use of

3 I borrow the word 'sated' from Kimon Friar's translation of the *Odysseia*, K, OMS, 1.2.

4 I am drawing on Jochen Schulte-Sasse's (1989) observations on the aesthetic in European eighteenth-century literature.

5 In the first edition of the *Odysseia*, Kazantzakis writes phonetically, using a simplified spelling and a monotonic system of accents; posthumous editions use the polytonic.

6 Kazantzakis and classicist Yannis Kakridis adopt this new meter in their translation of Homer's *Iliad* into Modern Greek. In a 1944 letter to writer Yiorgos Theotokas Kazantzakis remarks that they are translating the *Iliad* to gauge "how much the Greek language and understanding have advanced" since Alexandros Pallis' attempt (SL, 594). Pallis' 1904 translation elicited protest by conservative philologists, who resisted any translation from Ancient Greek.

this dynamic metre for his creative purposes, he explains how the addition of two extra syllables liberates him from the staid use of folk patterns to accommodate his aesthetic vision in its philosophical ponderings:⁷ “that venerable verse seemed to me too worn-out; it lacks the breath of life and is no longer capable of containing the fiery contemporary spirit which is suffering and longing to break the limits stifling it; longing to create a broader, deeper rhythm. These two additional syllables give the epic an unexpected amplitude, majesty and, at the same time, disciplined violence.”⁸

In the *Odysseia* Kazantzakis devises a literary language that integrates rare regional words, drawn primarily from the spoken idiom of the people, and only sparingly uses examples of his own Cretan dialect.⁹ His brand of the vernacular, however, confounded his early critics and necessitated the appendage of a specialized glossary of some 1600 words to the *Odysseia*'s first edition, which came out in 300 copies (SL 545n.). Greek philologists of Kazantzakis' time were still engrossed in the “language debate”, which entailed a struggle over choosing an appropriate linguistic register to represent national consciousness in Greek letters, education and public life: vernacular Greek, the *demotike*, or a scholastic Greek, the *katharevousa*, an artificial form of the language, born in the Greek Enlightenment and based on the Attic language of the classical period, which sought to purify the language of loan words that were non-Greek in etymological origin by adapting ancient formulations. His painstaking linguistic work in the *Odysseia* confirms that Kazantzakis was an avowed demoticist.¹⁰

Vibrant in tone, his modernized epic breaks through a confined understanding of national tradition. As this present volume is devoted to epic continuations, Kazantzakis' *Odysseia* is an important example to consider in the current spate of discussions on the question of interpretation in classical reception when considering the context of a specific national culture.¹¹ Kazantza-

7 Kazantzakis' new metre generated controversy. In a 1927 letter to Eleni Samiou, he writes of critics' reaction to an early published draft of the poem: “They find the meter awkward; they'd prefer the fifteen-syllable verse. ... As for me, I feel my soul breathing comfortably within my meter” (SL, 247).

8 From a 1947 letter written by Kazantzakis to Börje Knös. Helen Kazantzakis (1968) 68.

9 He solicited rare words from writers, such as Pantelis Prevelakis, who prepared the *Odysseia*'s glossary. In 1941, Kazantzakis sent the glossary to lexicographer Emmanuel Kriaras for possible inclusion in Kriaras' forthcoming demotic Greek dictionary (see SL, 544–545).

10 See Peter Bien (1972) on Kazantzakis' views on national language and his work in the *Odysseia*. For discussion on debates over national identity, literature and language in Modern Greece, see Gregory Jusdanis (1991) and Dimitris Tziouvas (1989).

11 Collections that explore classical reception and national culture include Lorna Hardwick (2003) and Susan A. Stephens and Phiroze Vasunia (2010). Studies that specifically address

kis ostensibly announces a debt to the classical tradition, while, at the same time, wishes to break free from that very tradition.¹² The poem speaks to ethical concerns that mark how twentieth-century continental philosophers read and interpret the ancient classics to comment on the rationalization of order in political culture in the wake of Axis aggression; it also bears the stamp of grappling with issues that preoccupy Greek intellectuals within the context of debates over national culture. In considering how Kazantzakis compares to other exponents within European thought in their interpretation of Homer we find that he, too, views epic as an authoritative text to ground his narrative method, a dialectic of the rational and irrational. Insofar as language is concerned, he produces a literary form of the Modern Greek vernacular as his base, one that integrates narrative elements derived from both high and low culture, ancient and popular¹³ literary traditions alike, to realize his aesthetic vision of the workings of human consciousness. The poem's play between ancient and modern cultural forms, high and low subject class positions, can be best described as being illustrative of a "vernacular classicism."¹⁴

The narrative's manipulation of epic and myth, however, markedly transformative and episodic in its story-telling technique, presents formidable challenges to the task of interpretation in its meandering through various conceptual paradigms. As readers we can overcome this issue by charting the trajectory of Odysseus's journey as a dialectic between the rational and the irrational, the real and the unreal, the concrete and the abstract. In the course of its narration the *Odysseia* evolves into a deeply meditative poem. In the figure of Odysseus, Kazantzakis represents the existential struggle of human consciousness as an *agon*. As Odysseus proceeds from one crisis to the next, the spirit is engaged in a continual ascent, in full cognition of impending death. In Kazantzakis' pointed use of epithets in Greek to describe Odysseus' qualities, he reveals that "fiery" spirit that cannot be contained—he is "αβόλευτος" ("rest-

Greek modernism and antiquity include David Ricks (1989) and Tziiovas (2014). Studies on the reception of Homer in twentieth-century world literature include Barbara Graziosi and Emily Greenwood (2007). On hermeneutic models in the discourses of Hellenism and Hebraism, see Vassilis Lambropoulos (1993).

- 12 The critic Dimitris Nikolareizis sees the *Odysseia* as "post-Dantean and Nietzschean." "[D]rawn from our own times," Kazantzakis "did not rekindle ancient Greek tradition; he stepped out of its boundaries." Nikolareizis (1947) 158.
- 13 Modern textual sources include folklore (proverbs, songs, tales, beliefs), laments, and dream interpretation. See Friar's notes, κ, OMS, 818–824.
- 14 I borrow the term "vernacular classicism" from Alan Colquhoun, who applies it to architectural styles (1986) 21 and 22.

less”), “αράθυμος” (“irascible”) and “αδρυσύντυχος” (“abrupt”) (κ, ο, ι. 868, ιι. 829, v. 881).¹⁵ Even as Odysseus is drawn to the contemplative life of the ascetic in the second half of the poem, Kazantzakis uses epithets that consistently refer to his hero's combative nature.

The sequel begins with scenes of violence and civil strife. Unlike Homer's *Odyssey*, Odysseus' return to Ithaka is not dramatized by tender scenes of reunification with members of his family. In fact, we find quite the opposite. Estranged from his wife, son, and father, the poem recalls Dante's sequel to Homer's *Odyssey* in Canto 26 of the *Inferno*.¹⁶ Odysseus thinks back on how he battled obstinate seas for Penelope. But, now, seeing her as unfaithful, he casts his gaze askance. He envisions her as entangled in the suitors' lifeless and naked limbs. The rage he continues to feel for these transgressors seemingly pierces through her (κ, ο, ι. 1108–112).

We then behold a compliant Penelope, who, fearful of Odysseus' wrath, barely utters any words; and, by contrast, a defiant Telemachus, who, emboldened by a renewed sense of empowerment, wants to initiate political dialogue. The people, however, are unmoved and voice anger over Helen's transgressions in inciting the Trojan war. They are victims of war—widows left behind by husbands killed at Troy, now abandoned and penniless; and warriors who survived the war, returning battered and wounded. Kazantzakis draws on a long tradition of sexualizing the figure of Helen in classical literature by interjecting epithets and substantives in vernacular Greek that objectify her beauty and ostracize her for licentiousness. Aware of the fatal consequences of Helen's beauty, the widows bewail their miserable conditions: “Our modest homes are ruined and our beds are covered in cobwebs / for the sake of a shameless, man-snaring whore” (κ, ο, ι. 148–149). Odysseus' hostility is seen in a similar light. One widow deems Odysseus a “wild murderer” undeserving of their loyalty, and advocates the poisoning of the king (κ, ο, ι. 141–142). An armless warrior targets Odysseus for emerging unscathed by the ravages of war. While he has had to sustain debilitating injuries, Odysseus' body has returned “unharméd” and “whole” (κ, ο, ι. 171).

The people's complaints quickly transform into political action. They plan a revolt. As they mobilize, they turn into an angry mob. The women are urged:

15 Cf. how ancient epithets reveal dramatic “method”, as Anne Carson demonstrates (2009) 4.

16 Kazantzakis translated Dante's *The Divine Comedy* into Greek before writing the *Odysseia*. According to W.B. Stanford, Kazantzakis' Odysseus is “an avatar of Dante's centrifugal hero, and derives from the tradition which leads from Dante through Tennyson and Pascoli to the present day.” (1968) 235.

“onward, fire, hold your torches high”; “tonight his palace will turn to ashes” (κ, O, I. 182–183). To quell the people’s anger, Telemachus, as heir to an aristocratic figure of authority, appeals to established forms of political deliberation through councils, “to follow the old kings and forefathers” (κ, O, I. 249). He considers the people’s complaints and, despite their differences in social class, proposes an egalitarian approach by “imparting freedom and bread justly” to all (κ, O, I. 248). But Odysseus ridicules his son’s conciliatory approach and rallies him to control the mob. Critical of the archons, Odysseus asserts absolute rule. When he finally confronts the people, he subdues them with empty promises. In Canto II Telemachus, however, having grown increasingly fearful of his father’s cruelty and watchful of his escalating brutality, attempts, along with the armless warrior, to overthrow Odysseus. Odysseus uncovers the plot, and, after confronting his son, vows to flee his homeland but not before pillaging his own palace and property. He has destroyed the very institutions and wealth that defined his royal identity.

Rather than remain in his kingdom to withstand the perils of revolt, Odysseus sets out on a new path of adventures, a trajectory of the *agon* laid out in concrete and abstract form. In Cantos III to VIII, the quelling of civil unrest through violent means becomes an important *leitmotif* that re-surfaces in differentiated cultural contexts circumscribed initially within Helladic space. Odysseus travels to Sparta to see King Menelaus, with whom he had fought at Troy. Outside the city limits, he witnesses a peasant revolt being organized against the king. Indecisive, at first, Odysseus eventually sides with royal power in the conflict. He hides his true loyalties by devising a ruse. Uttering a startled cry, he warns the peasants of an impending Dorian attack to persuade them to ask for Menelaus’ protection and acquiesce to his rule.

As figures of aristocratic power, Menelaus and Helen come across as ineffectual. Menelaus appears debilitated. Helen, overcome with *ennui*, demonstrates a lack of commitment. After questioning her on whether she or a “shade” went to Troy (κ, O, IV. 1094–1096), wherein Kazantzakis alludes to Stesichoros’ counter-myth,¹⁷ Odysseus impulsively abducts Helen, who willingly accompanies him to escape the “security” of her provincial abode.¹⁸ But he struggles over succumbing to Helen’s beauty. Cognizant of the “carnal” (κ, OMS, III. 671)

17 See Anne Carson’s “Red Meat” essays, Parts I and II, and Appendices A–C, in *Autobiography of Red* (1998) in which she translates and discusses the counter-tradition, attributed to Stesichoros, that maintains Helen never went to Troy.

18 In explaining the germination of the *Odysseia* in *Report to Greco*, Kazantzakis says that Helen “was pining away on the banks of the Eurotas, constricted like ourselves by security, virtue, and the comfortable life.” Kazantzakis (1965) 488.

knowledge that she represents, which informs the “secret purpose” of his quest (κ, O. III.670–672; 847), Odysseus prefers to gaze upon her. While Kazantzakis' portrayal of an overtly sexualized Helen can be seen as a stark form of feminine essentialism, he has stated that he also sees her as emblematic of “Achaean beauty” (κ, OMS, 819, n.). In portraying Helen as an object of aesthetic beauty (κ, O, III.667; XVII.59–62) and as an autonomous and independent spirit, Kazantzakis draws on how Helen in Homeric epic manifests “the power of the aphrodisiac in polis life” (Chytry 1989: xxxviii). Kazantzakis, at the same time, recalls exponents in German aestheticism, who sought knowledge through the sensuous apprehension of reality, and looked upon mythological figures like Helen as the embodiment of the aesthetic ideal.

Odysseus and Helen flee to the palace at Knossos in Crete, where they find King Idomeneus, who also fought at Troy. Tempted by her beauty, Idomeneus makes preparations to marry Helen in bull rituals. Odysseus rejects the king's decadence and marries Helen to a “barbaric” Dorian prince after assisting Phida, Idomeneus' daughter, in a peasant revolt against her father. Phida murders Idomeneus in the bloody rampage, and the palace is burned. Later, when Odysseus escapes to Egypt and witnesses other instances of civil strife between peasants and autocratic rulers (Cantos x and XI), his desire to build a new resplendent city, revealed by God, is thwarted (Canto XI).¹⁹

The schema underlying these episodes of civil strife present Odysseus in varying political positions: from an aristocratic ruler who reverts to violence to uphold absolute power in accordance with local law and custom, to one who weighs opposing sides in civil strife but, in the end, advocates a languishing form of aristocratic rule; but when aristocratic rule is found, even further, to be decadent and alienating, he sides against it. Odysseus' shifting of positions illustrates the contingencies of ideological commitment.²⁰ He has become more distant, now that he has left Helladic space and shed his royal position, a stranger without a clearly defined local identity in the remote places he visits beyond the Mediterranean who gradually discards a life of action and political engagement.

We can draw parallels to Kazantzakis' own shifting of ideological positions both before and during the period in which he wrote the *Odysseia*, from 1925

19 Friar (1979) 14.

20 As Kazantzakis replies to Emile Hourmouzios in a 1943 letter, Odysseus does not represent a specific political position. He “is a general slogan that [can] interpreted [differently] by various epochs.” (SL, 588).

to its publication in 1938.²¹ Kazantzakis was a keen first-hand observer of nationalist uprisings and civil strife, as he was dispatched all over the world as a government official and, later, as a journalist in the early decades of the twentieth century. He had witnessed nations caught up in the throes of political turmoil, representative of all points along the political spectrum from left to right: from Russia's conflict-ridden attempts to implement communism after the revolution and the outbreak of the Spanish civil war to Hitler's virulent rise to power in Germany, the latter a formidable example of an aggressive form of political nationalism.²²

In the 1940s Kazantzakis became increasingly critical of political aggression, and it held an integral place in his social commentary. It is specifically in the throes of Axis aggression in Greece and around the world that Kazantzakis published a defence of the *Odysseia* in the journal *Nea Estia* in 1943.²³ By this time, Greece had already been occupied by the Axis powers, and the Greek government and the monarchy were in exile in Egypt. In his defence, Kazantzakis advocates the need for epic form in such turbulent times. He believes that the political instability wrought by world war and occupation is responsible for generating a general feeling of anxiety and cultural malaise. As he explains, the epic enables the modern artist to dramatize the social turmoil that is created by the succession of one form of power to another in this "period of transition" ("μεσοβασιλείας"):

There is no more [a need] for epic than in the present time. Epics are created in [precisely] such periods of transition from one form of autocratic rule to another, when one form of myth is dissolved and another strives to supplant it. For me, the *Odysseia* is modern man's novel attempt in dramatic epic form [to express] the contemporary feeling of anxiety and, in pursuing the idea of hope, boldly finds freedom. What kind of freedom? He does not know starting out; he fashions it from struggling—out of joy and bitterness, through his failures and successes and disappointments. The true modern man, who lives in his age in profound [awareness] ... continuously reckons with this *agon*.

KAZANTZAKIS, (1943) 1028

-
- 21 Peter Bien has written extensively of the evolution of Kazantzakis' political views during this period in *Politics of the Spirit*, Vols I (1989) and II (2007).
 - 22 See Kazantzakis' travel books *Spain* (1963) and *Russia* (1989) and his fictionalized autobiography, *Report to Greco* (1965) for evidence of these views.
 - 23 Kazantzakis wrote his defence in response to issues raised in a study on the *Odysseia* by critic Vassilios Laourdas (1943).

These periods of transition, he maintains, enable the creative artist to “look back” “to judge past civilizations that have fallen” or “to look ahead” and “project” the newly arising. Odysseus, Kazantzakis argues, personifies that ability. Odysseus “struggles as he looks ahead” perhaps “because we are approaching” “a new Myth.”²⁴ In Kazantzakis’ looking at periods of political transition as generating a feeling of malaise is a theory about the rise and fall of civilizations, which, Peter Bien points out, recalls Spengler’s *The Decline of the West*. Much admired by Kazantzakis, Spengler’s book resonated with his own critique of the shortcomings of capitalism, though he increasingly became disillusioned with communism upon visiting Russia.²⁵

Kazantzakis’ remarks on the significance of the figure of Odysseus are based on an understanding of the transformative power of myth (which he uses interchangeably with epic) to signify intense moments of crisis. We have already seen how violence can signal a crisis, as an outcome of civil strife and political turmoil, but for Kazantzakis this *leitmotif* is only one aspect of myth’s transformative power, as it realized in his poem. It is also a sign of an existential crisis.²⁶ In a letter written to Emile Hourmouzios in 1943, Kazantzakis discusses how Odysseus embodies this understanding of “myth.”²⁷ “Odysseus fashions a myth—rather, he does not fashion a myth, he lives one, he himself *is* the myth. But all the molds break, and everything vanishes at given moments of great intensity, at crises that last a lightning flash ...” (SL, 589). He draws parallels to crises articulated as existential moments of despair, referring to them as “nihilistic”, as he believes they are voiced in ancient antecedents:

Do we not see the same thing in Pindar, the great worshipper and singer ... of the palpable exploit, of assurance that life is worthy? Nevertheless, that same Pindar must have been overcome by despair at some point when he uttered his ghastly nihilistic outcry: *σκιᾶς ὄναρ ἀνθρώπου*!²⁸ Do not Sophocles and Homer ... sometimes shout the same cry?

SL, 589

²⁴ Kazantzakis (1943) 1028–1029.

²⁵ Bien (1989) 63.

²⁶ Kazantzakis’ 1910 dissertation (2006) discusses the concept of nihilism in Nietzsche. Bien provides commentary on this controversial subject in relation to Kazantzakis’ own thought (1989) 191–193.

²⁷ Kazantzakis is inconsistent in his use of the term myth. In his travel book, *Journey to the Morea*, written before the *Odysseia*, he draws on anthropological approaches and defines myth as symbolic archetype in interpreting Greek sculpture. Kazantzakis (1965) 67–68.

²⁸ *Pythian* 8.95–96: “humankind is the dream of a shadow” (SL, 586n.).

Odysseus, Kazantzakis explains, utters the same “nihilistic outcry.” When Odysseus says “And this One does not exist!”, it should not be interpreted as the “culmination of his struggle”; but as a “valve” that he opens up in the moment to ward off despair. In this way, Kazantzakis concludes, Odysseus “finds relief, gains courage from the horror, and continues on the path he has chosen, the Ascent.” (SL, 589)

As the *Odysseia* addresses the theme of violence in its integral connection to the wielding of political power, and interjects a facet of Kazantzakis’ own social commentary, the Homeric text serves as a foundational text upon which to conduct just such a critique—which emerges as a *topos* in classical reception within twentieth-century continental thought in its penchant for constructing parallels between antiquity and modernity, making the past and the present seemingly relative despite marked cultural differences between two distinct epochs and their socio-political values.

In drawing on Homeric epic to comment on the mechanisms of violence, Kazantzakis’ treatment of the subject in the *Odysseia* resonates with an argument made by the French philosopher Simone Weil in her essay on Homer and the theme of force. Weil’s essay was written in 1940, after the Nazi invasion and the fall of France.²⁹ For Weil, the “true hero”, “subject” and “centre” of Homeric epic is “force.” Homeric epic is not merely to be seen as a social document of its time but as a mirror that reflects similar instances of aggression in global history in which the eruption of overt forms of political nationalism³⁰ threaten modernity’s investment in the ideal of progress:

Force employed by man, force that enslaves man, force before which man’s flesh shrinks away. In this work, at all times, the human spirit is shown as modified by its relations with force, as swept away, blinded by the force it imagined it could handle, as deformed by the weight of the force it submits to. For those dreamers who considered that force, thanks to progress, would soon be a thing of the past, the *Iliad* could appear as an historical document; for others, whose power of recognition are more acute and who perceive force, today as yesterday, at the very center of human history, the *Iliad* is the purest and loveliest of mirrors.

WEIL 1965, 6

29 I thank poet and classical scholar, Anne Carson, for drawing my attention to Weil’s essay.

30 Scholars make a distinction between political and cultural nationalism: the former is represented by political revolution, violent aggression and irredentism; whereas the latter reflects the activity of the intelligentsia in its cultural institutions to promote national consciousness, identity and unity. See Hobsbawm (1990) and John Plamenatz (1976) 23–

In view of Weil's remarks, the value of epic is in providing narrative frames that can be manipulated to comment on issues that speak to a modern sensibility—in this instance on how mechanisms of violence permeate all aspects of social life and expression. Such a reading of epic suppresses real historical time to present ideal conditions from which to examine one of many existential questions that preoccupied writers, especially ascetics like Kazantzakis and Weil, in confronting the inevitability of death and opening a path for the contemplative life in rejecting such nihilism and destruction.

Also implied in Weil's remarks is an awareness of how classical philology sees Homeric epic as "a thing of the past", "an historical document", as she puts it. Her understanding here makes reference to an important trend evolving within the discourse of European classical scholarship. Since the nineteenth century, with the strides made by archaeological excavation in producing empirical evidence that Greek epic is indicative of an actual historical period, reading Homer as a source to construct a social history of the archaic period has become an important practice. Classical philologists in their interpretation of authoritative ancient texts increasingly made an important distinction between epic and myth.³¹ As epic was relegated to the field of history, myth was relegated to the category of symbolic archetype in the fields of anthropology and psychology. But the premise upon which those disciplinary boundaries were based became subject to criticism by philosophers.

Written in the throes of Axis aggression, as early as 1942, the theorists Max Horkheimer and Theodor Adorno in *Dialectic of Enlightenment* (1947) expose the basis upon which the rationalization of order fuelled Germany's virulent form of political nationalism. The idea of order is not a modern concept but can be traced to the Enlightenment period, which read the classics as foundational texts to validate political principles even anachronistically at times. Their reading of Homeric epic in particular looks upon it as providing a model of rational order. In discussing Homer's *Odyssey*, they make direct reference to the same evolving trend, noted earlier, in the discourse of classical philology, in this case in German Hellenism from Hegel to Nietzsche and Wilamowitz,³² in which epic is becoming increasingly differentiated from myth. They argue

24. Although progressive in nature, nationalism is often expressed in reactionary and ethnocentric forms, as in its zeal for "biological" and linguistic purity. Seton-Watson (1977).

31. For a discussion of these trends in British classical scholarship, as represented in the work of historian John Pentland Mahaffy and anthropologist Jane Harrison, see Frank Turner (1984).

32. See Katie Fleming (2012) who also discusses both Weil's and Horkheimer and Adorno's texts. Kazantzakis was well read in German and French classical philology (SL, 555n).

against such a differentiation, which they deem to be false. The two concepts of epic and myth should be seen as converging. Epic and myth should be looked upon as a dialectic, a synthesis of two related and opposing ideas of the rational and the irrational.

To justify their reading, they argue that epic is organically “bound” to myth; its tales of adventures have their origin in folk tradition. In their view, the way in which epic “organizes” the presentation of myths illustrates how “the Homeric spirit” is, in essence, opposing them. Epic and myth delineate “two phases of an historical process” that can be detected “along the seams” of Homeric narrative. The epic, they argue, “dissolves the hierarchical order of society by the exoteric form of its presentation, even—and precisely there—where it glorifies this same order.” In singing of Odysseus’ wanderings, in epic narrative there is, as they put it: “already the nostalgic stylization of what may no longer be sung. And the hero of the adventure proves to be the prototype of the bourgeois individual, whose concept originates in that coherent self-assertion the primordial model of which is rendered by the beleaguered hero.”³³

Their reading of the *Odyssey* interprets the wandering of Odysseus as indicative of the erosion of the social order—the bourgeois individual, who travels away from his kingdom in the manifold adventures he embarks upon. The narrative, in unfolding the parallel sequences of epic and myth, represents a dialectic of the rational and the irrational. The epic, the “historical-philosophical” precursor to the novel, does not completely dissolve linear narrative elements in its model of story-telling. They maintain that in the epic “novelistic” strains “begin to show through, and the venerable meaning-charged cosmos of the Homeric world reveals itself to be the work of ordering reason, which destroys myth precisely by means of the rational order in which it reflects myth.”³⁴ They deem the journey of the wandering Homeric hero, then, as representing the path of the self coming into self-consciousness.

These views resonate with the model of the wandering Odysseus, as realized in Kazantzakis’ *Odysseia*. In Canto 1 after returning to Ithaka, Odysseus surveys his farming lands, a staple of his bourgeois status, and then recalls the perils he had encountered at sea. He thinks about how to present these adventures to his family and selects formative experiences from his mind’s memory bank: key encounters with Calypso, Circe and Nausika, wherein Kazantzakis presents a composite of Homer’s account. These encounters fall into a pattern in which Odysseus re-orders his lived experience to demonstrate his solip-

33 Adorno and Horkheimer (1992) 109.

34 Adorno and Horkheimer (1992) 109.

sistic suffering while abroad, vexed by the constant awareness of impending death in clashes with violent elements of the supernatural and natural cosmos. Herein Kazantzakis reveals the overall pattern of the poem in exploring the rational and irrational workings of the mind in the parallel realms of epic and myth. Odysseus, moreover, reveals how constructed these stories are for he has carefully manipulated the truth in his structuring of them: "The crafty voyager falls silent and stealthily looks about / how to cover up the truth, masterfully, with deception" (Κ, O, II. 71–72). After he reminisces with Helen on the storied events of Troy, momentarily questioning their validity, Odysseus interprets physical phenomena around him, too, as having been transformed into myth: "everything turned to stone ... and dim life burst into stars and turned into mythic fable" (Κ, O, III. 1075–1076). A minstrel reveals to Odysseus three guiding mythic figures that have driven his path since childhood. Tantalus, Hercules and Prometheus have bequeathed to him an "insatiable heart", brilliant insight, and a fiery, "laborious" nature, mental abilities in Odysseus that surface later in key episodes to illustrate his agonistic spirit (Friar, Κ, OMS, 779).

Odysseus' experiences along the journey personify a broader exploration of how the self defines consciousness. Each successive episode presents a facet of consciousness and a desire to exceed its limits. He articulates the notion of freedom in all aspects of its implications—from the political to the spiritual. In his 1943 letter to Emile Hourmouzios, Kazantzakis reveals the broad outline of his conceptual design in the moulding of Odysseus:

... Odysseus's selfhood widened as he advanced, ... it smashed each and every mold—individual, self, family, nation, race, species, organic being, universe. I felt him continually identifying with the fearful, indestructible, and totally mysterious *élan* that appears on our planet in the form of Life. Odysseus, and I with him, sensed that *élan* acquiring consciousness, creating eyes which to see, ears with which to hear, a heart with which to experience joy and pain.

SL, 588

Kazantzakis initially alludes here to various identity markers that speak specifically to Greek society of his time. The idea of the individual is usually placed in relation to the family and, by association, to the nation. Commentators on Modern Greek culture have established that the idea of individualism, born of Western liberalism, does not resonate in the case of Greece, for overwhelmingly a collective national consciousness overrides an individualistic one. Embedded in Kazantzakis' remarks in this letter is a critique of nationalism, the overarching ideology that Kazantzakis in his political thought found to be repressive.

In this sense, he deviates from his Greek contemporaries' preoccupation with varying articulations of nationalism.³⁵ The journey, as realized in the poem, presents Odysseus moving away from social markers that define his identity and gravitating towards life-affirming (i.e., *élan*) and theistic ones.³⁶ The play of epic and myth, vacillating between the rational and the irrational, the physical and the ephemeral, ideally comes to the service of projecting alternative states of consciousness in the realm of the human imagination.

As Kazantzakis considered the *Odysseia* his life's work, the poem is often seen as a repository of elements of his philosophical thought during the period in which Kazantzakis laboriously prepared the manuscript. The writing of the *Odysseia* was an intensive process in which the poem went through many drafts. It is during this period that he revised many of his philosophical positions and developed an evolving asceticism that culminates in his 1927 treatise, *Askitiki*, or *Saviors of God: Spiritual Exercises*.³⁷ *Askitiki* presents his credo of the metaphorical ascent in terms of the transubstantiation of the flesh into spirit.³⁸ Insofar as the life of the mind is concerned, in *Askitiki* Kazantzakis elaborates on how one has a duty to observe the mind, in how it dictates order; but one must also exceed its limits, a thesis that informs Books XIV and XVI of the *Odysseia*.³⁹

In critical commentary,⁴⁰ Odysseus' allegorical journey has been recast in the form of an existential quest for freedom in which Kazantzakis tests the limits of a number of philosophical ideas (Nietzschean, Bergsonian, Kierkegaardian), religious traditions (Christian and Buddhist), ideologies (nationalism, communism, populism) and epistemologies (idealism, rationalism, subjectivity) that preoccupied him in his creative, philosophical and political writing. According to Friar, Kazantzakis is purportedly to have said in a newspaper interview that Odysseus is the person who has liberated himself from all plans and systems whether religions, philosophies, or ideologies. He experiences the full spectrum of life and its varying forms (Friar, Intro. κ, OMS, xi).

35 Tziouvas (1989) discusses nationalist formulations coined by Kazantzakis' contemporaries.

36 See Bien (1989) and Friar ("Introduction" to κ, OMS, xvi–xvii) on Kazantzakis' interpretation of Henri Bergson's formulation of the *élan vital*, the vital or creative life force.

37 Kazantzakis (1960).

38 See Bien's discussion of *Askitiki* as a political critique of capitalism. (1989) 71.

39 Friar (1979) 23.

40 E.g., Bien (1989), (2007), Bien and Middleton (1997), and Makridis' "Introduction" to Kazantzakis (2006). Kazantzakis' radical critique of Christianity has elicited protest in Greece and abroad.

What makes the *Odysseia* inherently difficult to interpret, however, is the fragmentation of ideas and frameworks contained therein—what can be described as epistemological rupture. For example, while one could make a case of how the *Odysseia* explores the nature of suffering in a Nietzschean sense, it does not resolve that human predicament in the pursuit of happiness.

But his affixing the overall structure of the poem on the idea of the ascent conveys a patterned sense of order. In the Prologue the narrator declares the poem a song, one that explores consciousness, the life of the mind, through the trials of Odysseus. By the poem's end, as Odysseus' spirit takes leave of his body, the poem goes on to simulate the idea of the gradual ascent of the spirit: "Flesh dissolved ... and the great mind surged to the summit of its holy freedom ... it leapt high into the air and broke free of its final cage ..." (κ, O, XXIV, 1390–1394). In the process of transcendence, the spirit achieves its autonomy and finds fullest expression in poetry.

Kazantzakis' engagement with the classics, in his use of epic and myth to formulate his sequel, deviates from the example of other Greek poets, such as George Seferis and Yannis Ritsos,⁴¹ later modernists who memorialize the bourgeois virtues of the fallen aristocratic hero.⁴² Kazantzakis' philosophical ponderings on the freedom of the spirit as a mode of self-consciousness find expression in epic and myth and adhere to a dialectic of order and disorder in the pattern of its narration. He resumes a tradition within Romanticism that looks upon poetry as a mode of transcendence in the symbolic realm of the aesthetic. Kazantzakis' example resonates more with Friedrich Hölderlin's, who believed that through the realm of poetry, one "must abolish the idea of the state or at least strip the entire miserable human construct of state, constitution, government, legislation—down to its very skin." To achieve this end, poetry reflects the idea of the freedom of the spirit and ascribes an enlightened understanding to myth as a mode of reason:

Until we render the ideas aesthetic, that is, mythological, they will not be of any interest to the populace, and vice versa: until mythology has become reasonable, the philosopher has to be ashamed of it. Thus the enlightened and the unenlightened finally have to shake hands; mythology must become philosophical in order to make the people reasonable, and philosophy must turn mythological ... No power will be suppressed any longer, then there prevails universal freedom and equality of the

41 E.g. see Ritsos' sequels *Helen* and *Agamemnon*.

42 On Seferis, see Martha Klironomos (2002).

spirits!—A higher spirit, sent from heavens, will have to found this new religion among us ...⁴³

HÖLDERLIN (1988) 155–156

Bibliography

- Adorno, Theodor W. and Max Horkheimer. (1992) "Odysseus or Myth and Enlightenment." Trans. Robert Hullot-Kentor. *New German Critique* 56 (Spring-Summer): 109–141.
- Bien, Peter. (1972) *Kazantzakis and the Linguistic Revolution in Greece*. Princeton.
- Bien, Peter. (1989) *Nikos Kazantzakis: Politics of the Spirit*. Vol. 1. Princeton.
- Bien, Peter and Darren J. Middleton, eds. (1996) *God's Struggler: Religion In the Writings of Nikos Kazantzakis*. Macon, GA.
- Bien, Peter. (2007) *Nikos Kazantzakis: Politics of the Spirit*. Vol. II. Princeton.
- Carson, Anne. (1998) *The Autobiography of Red*. New York.
- Carson, Anne. (2009) *An Oresteia*. New York.
- Chytry, Josef. (1989) *The Aesthetic State: A Quest in Modern German Thought*. Berkeley and Los Angeles.
- Colquhoun, Alan. (1991) *Modernity and the Classical Tradition: Architectural Essays 1980–1987*. Cambridge and London.
- Fleming, Katie. (2012) "Odysseus and Enlightenment: Horkheimer and Adorno's *Dialektik der Aufklärung*." *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 19 (2): 107–128.
- Friar, Kimon. (1979) *The Spiritual Odyssey of Nikos Kazantzakis: A Talk*. Minneapolis.
- Graziosi, Barbara and Emily Greenwood, eds. (2007) *Homer in the Twentieth Century: Between World Literature and the Western Canon*. Oxford.
- Hardwick, Lorna. (2003) *Classical Receptions*. Oxford.
- Hobsbawm, Eric. (1990) *Nations and Nationalism since 1780: Programme, Myth, Reality*. Cambridge.
- Hölderlin, Friedrich. (1988) *Essays and Letters on Theory*. Ed. and trans. Thomas Pfau. Albany.
- Homer. (1995) *The Odyssey*. Vols. I and II. Loeb Classical Library. Trans. A.T. Murray and George E. Dimock. Cambridge.
- Jusdanis, Gregory. (1991) *Belated Modernity and Aesthetic Culture: Inventing National Literature*. Minneapolis.
- Kazantzakis, Eleni. (1968) *Nikos Kazantzakis: A Biography Based on His Letters*. Trans. Amy Mims. New York.

43 I thank Professor of Modern Greek literature, Vassilis Lambropoulos, for drawing my attention to this text by Hölderlin.

- Kazantzakis, Nikos. (1938) *Odysseia*. Athens.
- Kazantzakis, Nikos. (1943) "A Note on the *Odysseia*." *Nea Estia* 34: 1029–1034.
- Kazantzakis, Nikos. (1958) *The Odyssey: A Modern Sequel*. Trans. and intro. Kimon Friar. New York.
- Kazantzakis, Nikos. (1960) *Saviors of God: Spiritual Exercises*. Trans. and intro. Kimon Friar. New York.
- Kazantzakis, Nikos. (1965) *Report to Greco*. Trans. Peter Bien. New York.
- Kazantzakis, Nikos. (1963) *Spain*. Trans. Amy Mims. New York.
- Kazantzakis, Nikos. (1989) *Russia: A Chronicle of Three Journeys in the Aftermath of the Revolution*. Trans. Thanasis Maskaleris and Michael Antonakes. Berkeley.
- Kazantzakis, Nikos. (2006) *Friedrich Nietzsche on the Philosophy of Right and the State*. Trans. and intro. Odysseus Makridis. Albany.
- Kazantzakis, Nikos. (2012) *The Selected Letters of Nikos Kazantzakis*. Ed. and trans. Peter Bien. Princeton.
- Klironomos, Martha. (2002) "Ancient ἀνάμνησις, National μνήμη in the Poetry of Giorgos Seferis." *Journal of Modern Greek Studies* 20. 2 (October): 215–239.
- Lambropoulos, Vassilis. (1993) *Anatomy of Interpretation: The Rise of Eurocentrism*. Princeton.
- Laourdas, Vassilios. (1943) *The Odysseia of Kazantzakis*. Athens.
- Nikolareizis, Dimitris. (1947) "The Presence of Homer in Modern Greek Poetry." *Nea Estia* 491: 153–164.
- Plamenatz, John. (1976) "Two Types of Nationalism." In *Nationalism: The Nature and Evolution of an Idea*. Ed. E. Kamenka. London. 22–36.
- Ricks, David. (1989) *The Shade of Homer: A Study on Modern Greek Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Schulte-Sasse, Jochen. (1989) "The Prestige of the Artist under Conditions of Modernity." *Cultural Critique* 12: 83–100.
- Seton-Watson, Hugh. (1977) *Nations and States: An Inquiry into the Origins of Nations and the Politics of Nationalism*. London.
- Stanford, W.B. (1968) *The Ulysses Theme. A Study in the Adaptability of a Traditional Hero*. Second Edition. Revised. New York.
- Stephens, Susan A. and Phiroze Vasunia, eds. (2010) *Classics and National Cultures*. Oxford.
- Turner, Frank. (1984) *The Greek Heritage in Victorian Britain*. New Haven.
- Tziovas, Dimitris. (1989) *The Metamorphosis of Nationism and the Ideologeme of Greekness during the Interwar Years*. Athens.
- Tziovas, Dimitris, ed. (2014) *Re-imagining the Past: Antiquity and Modern Greek Culture*. Oxford.
- Weil, Simone. (1965) "The Iliad: A Poem of Force." Trans. Mary McCarthy. *Chicago Review* 18.2: 5–30.

Spinning a Thread of One's Own from Homer to Atwood

Buket Akgün

Margaret Atwood's *The Penelopiad* is one of the titles in Canongate Myth Series, a series of novels written by contemporary authors to offer their reception and retelling of ancient myths. Atwood's novel is a gendered continuation of Homer's epic the *Odyssey*, but, as mentioned in its Introduction and Notes, Atwood has also drawn on many other mythical sources, especially for Penelope's life. The novel mostly focuses on the lives of Penelope and the maids rather than the adventures of Odysseus during his homebound journey following the Trojan War, or those of Telemachus. Penelope and the twelve hanged maids narrate the classical myth, with the benefit of hindsight, from the 21st century and from Hades. Atwood asserts that she has always been haunted by the hanged maids, which is probably why, in Chapter xxiii, entitled "Odysseus and Telemachus Snuff the Maids", she portrays them like the ghosts of female victims in Japanese horror films while referring to snuff films in the title. Atwood has also been haunted by two questions after reading the epic: what was the actual reason behind the hanging of the maids and what was Penelope really doing? In the continuation Penelope and the hanged maids answer these questions, but their answers contradict one another. So do their narratives. The maids accuse Penelope of having affairs with the suitors and having the maids hanged so that they cannot tell about her affairs whereas Penelope puts all the blame on Eurykleia. Like the original epic, Penelope's narrative abounds with inconsistencies and contradictions, which makes the readers wonder if Penelope is just another Helen, albeit a more clever and ruthless one when it comes to keeping her deeds a secret and getting away with it. Suffice it to say that, in her continuation, Atwood does not really provide any answers to the questions that haunt her. She only makes sure that they haunt her readers as well.

I aim to deliberate over how Atwood's *The Penelopiad*, as a continuation of Homer's *Odyssey*, uses gender as a means to subvert the male-forged myths regarding masculinity and femininity, whereas the original epic is regarded as misogynistic in spite of the character of the faithful, patient, cunning, and, yet, modest Penelope. Penelope's and the twelve maids' narratives in *The Penelopiad*, just like the novel itself, prove that it is possible to disrupt the phallogocentric male discourse, the myth of Penelope and Odysseus to be specific, by repeating, retelling, and re-interpreting it. Judith Butler sees gender as a mechanism

that produces and naturalizes notions of masculine and feminine. Accordingly, many feminist theorists, such as Sheila Murnaghan, Lilian Doherty, Luce Irigaray, Seyla Benhabib, and Amy Allen, believe that gender is a cultural and social determinant of any discourse and narrative. However, just as Toril Moi does, Butler argues that it is also possible to use this very same mechanism to deconstruct and denaturalize such notions.¹ As Vanda Zajko points out, the historical distance allows Atwood to reject and upset the gender ideology of Homer's epic.² It allows Penelope and the twelve maids, the marginalized, suppressed, and silenced female characters of the epic, to escape from the "[z]one of silence";³ to use Irigaray's terminology, to spin their own threads, to tell their own tales in the first person in the continuation, and to subvert the phallogocentric discourse of the original epic. Indeed, the maids' narrative undermines not only Homer's epic but also Penelope's own narrative in the continuation. Atwood's novel is an "inversion"⁴ as well as a continuation of Homer's epic, in that it turns around the portrayal of female characters in the epic to designate their opposites. Moreover, at the end of the novel, the maids make sure that the Erinyes, alongside the maids themselves, will haunt Odysseus everywhere, including all narratives down to marginal notes, so that he finds no rest in any new life into which he is reborn or in any discourse.

In Atwood's continuation Penelope complains about the official version gaining ground. Homer's epic, resonant with Butler's performative, is a compilation of authoritative examples enacted and reenacted, told and retold by different characters.⁵ Atwood's Penelope resents the original epic, for it turns her into "[a]n edifying legend" and "[a] stick used to beat other women with"⁶ by praising her patience and loyalty. Penelope's resentment of the original epic, in turn, echoes the fear of being defined by the phallogocentric discourse and being trapped in the male-forged gender myths and images of the patriarchal ideology.⁷ Penelope's decision to spin a thread of her own and tell her own story to upset the original epic, yet again, draws a parallel with the feminist theorists' analogy between weaving and women's language and writing. As far as

1 Cf. Murnaghan (1987) 107, Doherty (1995) 87, Speer (2005) 49, Benhabib et al. (1995) 2, Allen (2007) 165, Moi (1985) 78, 131, and Butler (2004) 42.

2 Zajko (2008) 206.

3 Irigaray (1985) 113.

4 In *The Penelopiad* Atwood does exactly what Annette Kolodny calls "inversion." See Kolodny (1975) 80.

5 See Butler (1995) 205.

6 Atwood (2005) 2.

7 Kolodny (1975) 83; Moi (1985) 36.

femininity in writing is concerned, Hélène Cixous suggests that “writing and voice are entwined and interwoven” while Justyna Sempruch likens herstory to Arachne’s weaving. Luce Irigaray, likewise, maintains that women’s language not only weaves its own discourse but also avoids being entangled in the phallocentric discourse.⁸

The female figures in Homer’s epic turn to weaving as a means of spinning a story, fabricating a lie, or controlling destiny. Athena, the artisanal goddess and inventor of weaving, challenges Arachne to a tapestry making contest, but when Arachne wins with a tapestry depicting the deeds of deities in a sarcastic and mocking manner, the goddess turns her into a spider.⁹ It is also noteworthy that the word “spider” etymologically means “to spin.” Penelope, waiting for her husband Odysseus to return home and trying to make her suitors wait, fabricates a lie and claims that she has to weave a shroud for her father-in-law before marrying one of the suitors. The shroud remains unfinished for years because every night she secretly undoes what she has done during the day. Circe is believed to weave destiny and thus to know everyone’s fate. As for the Fates, their will is above even the will of gods.¹⁰ Clotho spins, Lachesis measures, and Atropos cuts the thread of life thus apportioning everyone’s destiny. Hence, Odysseus’ desire to control the Fates in Atwood’s continuation.

It is not only Penelope and the maids who spin a tale of their own to overturn the male-forged myths. In Homer’s epic Helen interferes with Odysseus’ narrative in an attempt to include her own narrative, praising her own *kleos*, glory, in which she claims to have recognized Odysseus in his beggar’s disguise and helped him and the Greeks in Troy. Odysseus, in contrast, tells that Helen has tried to have the Achaeans killed by mimicking the voice of each one’s wife to make them come out of the Trojan Horse. In the continuation Helen, in like manner, tells a different version of the story of her abduction as a child and claims that the men who died in the Athenian war were a tribute to herself. Moreover, in the continuation, Helen seems to avoid being entangled in the web of phallocentric discourse by overplaying the gender role ascribed to her through Irigaray’s mimicry, that is through miming her own sexuality in a masculine mode.¹¹ According to Penelope, Helen practices and, indeed, overdoes gender roles by flirting with her dog, mirror, comb, and bedpost. She

8 Cf. Cixous and Clément (1996) 92, Sempruch (2008) 54, and Irigaray (1985) 29.

9 See Feldherr (2010) 60, 42; Buxton (2013) 195.

10 See Bernabé and Jiménez San Cristóbal (2008) 318; Campbell (1991) 179–180.

11 See Moi (1985) 135 and Irigaray (1985) 27, 76. Similarly, Butler defines gender as “a *stylized repetition of acts*.” Butler (2010) 191.

exploits the sexual stereotype of the seductress for her own political purposes; she practically does anything she wants to do and gets away with it. Contrary to Irigaray's general assumption,¹² Helen is compensated for her efforts because her pleasure does come from being chosen as an object of desire by men. Actually, Penelope is projecting her suppressed desires and transgression onto Helen even though she claims that she never transgressed. She moans that no man will ever kill himself for her. As opposed to the ugly duckling, "plain-Jane Penelope" who "weren't exactly a Helen",¹³ Helen has a swan-like beauty and is not ashamed of displaying her sexuality. She takes baths where everyone can watch her in Hades and shows a bare breast when she is conjured to the world of the living. Most importantly, Helen remains as a menace to the phallocentric order, being naughty, causing uproar, even making empires fall, each time she is reborn. Penelope is still jealous of Helen in the afterlife because she is never summoned by conjurers whereas Helen, on the contrary, "was much in demand. It didn't seem fair—I wasn't known for doing anything notorious, especially of a sexual nature, and she was nothing if not infamous."¹⁴ Penelope chooses not to be born again and again into the same phallocratic power structure so as not to legitimize socially established gender roles through reenactment.¹⁵ So, her only means of acquiring knowledge as to what is going in the world of the living is through conjuring, dreams, or infiltrating the new ethereal-wave system, that is taking a peep through television screens. Not surprisingly, every profession Odysseus and Telemachus have when they are reborn, has to do with disguise, deceit, and unscrupulousness. As Penelope mentions, Telemachus is "by nature a spinner of falsehoods like his father."¹⁶ Telemachus is a Member of Parliament while Odysseus has been a French general, a Mongolian invader, a tycoon in America, a headhunter in Borneo, a film star, an inventor, and an advertising man. In other words, the father and the son play the role of the new hero of the Western society who, as Karen Armstrong avers, "was venturing into uncharted realms for the sake of his society."¹⁷

12 See Irigaray (1985) 84.

13 Atwood (2005) 37, 102.

14 Atwood (2005) 20.

15 See Butler (2010) 191.

16 Atwood (2005) 137.

17 Armstrong (2005) 127. According to Alan G. Johnson, too, this new hero of the Western society is mostly male. See Johnson (2005) 91–92. Robert A. Segal, states, similarly, that hero myths, one example of secular myths, are created as a result of the decline of religion and rise of science. See Segal (2013) 116.

Penelope acts outside her gender roles in Homer's epic, but chooses to remain silent and not to take credit for her cunning. Instead she attributes most of it to either Athena, another female character, albeit a deity, or Odysseus. In the epic Odysseus' twenty-year absence leaves Ithaca in disorder and at the mercy of the suitors, who are determined to consume Odysseus' livelihood, and thereby Telemachus' inheritance, to force Penelope into choosing one of them for marriage. In contrast, in Atwood's continuation, what Penelope accomplishes during the absence of Odysseus is the very definition of heroic male identity, which, for Sam Keen, consists of knowing how to manage a place to which one is entrusted and how to make astute decisions regarding the handling, usage, and preserving of what one is left in charge.¹⁸ Regardless, she gains *kleos*, not as a hero, but as a patient, loyal, and thoughtful wife protecting the *oikos*, the household, because phallogocentric discourse defines heroism with regard to men and what men do. Penelope's not taking credit for her cunning plans and informing Odysseus about how she has been single-handedly running his estates "with womanly modesty"¹⁹ illustrates what Cixous calls a woman's aptitude to "deappropriate herself without self-interest"²⁰—not posing a threat to a man's authority within the framework of phallogocentric order. Irigaray points out that in terms of masculine parameters, which define female sexuality as a lack of phallus, a woman, being "marked phallicly" by her father and/or husband is regarded as nothing but commodity with a use and/or exchange value.²¹ Therefore, she tries to compensate for what she lacks through subservient displays of love towards her father as well as her husband, through giving birth, preferably to a boy, to substitute for the penis she lacks.²² Accordingly, Eurycleia keeps reminding Penelope that her "job" is to "have a nice big son for Odysseus",²³ which mirrors the constant and contemporary effort to confirm an allegedly natural association between femininity and maternity as well as to reduce the social role of women to reproduction.²⁴ Consequently, Penelope's only victory over Helen is her giving birth to a son before the latter.

18 Keen (1991) 180.

19 Atwood (2005) 89.

20 Cixous and Clément (1996) 87.

21 Irigaray (1985) 31.

22 Irigaray (1985) 23–24.

23 Atwood (2005) 63. Doherty notes that in classical Greek societies the primary roles of men were being a citizen and a warrior, whereas the primary roles of women were being a wife and a mother. Doherty (2003) 137.

24 Butler (2004) 182, 186.

Likewise, Eurycleia herself seems to fill in the gaps in her repressed sexuality, to use Irigaray's discourse yet again, by playing the role of the surrogate mother first to Odysseus, then to his son Telemachus, and eventually to a dozen dead babies in Hades, which seems like her eternal punishment for having served the phallogocentric male order.

Staying alive seems to be a challenge in itself in both the epic and the continuation, let alone asserting oneself or gaining *kleos*. In the continuation Penelope points out the fact that Odysseus' grandfather and Penelope's father attempted to kill them as children. Odysseus threatens to dismember and then to hang Penelope if he ever finds out she has been unfaithful. Penelope also fears that Telemachus might be considering killing her to get rid of the suitors and keep his inheritance. Indeed, by associating her bridal veil with a shroud, Penelope draws a connection between marriage and death long before her husband and her son pose threats to her very life.²⁵ Telemachus has grown up without a father, though with Athena as his guide and patron. He needs to learn to assert himself, establish his authority in Ithaca, and surpass his father, whom he has not had a chance to know. Penelope makes sure her son hears only the nobler versions of the tales about his father's adventures, the ones praising Odysseus as a handsome and intelligent warrior. Orestes, who had to kill his mother Clytemnestra to avenge the murder of his father Agamemnon, is yet another example drawn for Telemachus. Irigaray defines the patriarchal order "as the *organization and monopolization of private property to the benefit of the head of the family*."²⁶ As seen in the example of Telemachus, as soon as he comes of age, the son is responsible for the protection and prosperity of his father's estate in his absence. In the *Odyssey* Telemachus insists on choosing the songs for the banquet, making a speech, and taking over his father's bow. In the continuation, similarly, Penelope is not pleased at all that, after running the palace for twenty years in the absence of her husband, her son is now at the age to order her about and claim his authority to take over his father's duties. On the one hand, Telemachus accuses his mother of being overemotional, lacking reason, and judgment. On the other hand, he accuses her of being cold and unaffectionate towards Odysseus upon her long-absent husband's revelation of his identity. Penelope gets so irritated at the way her son treats her that she wishes for another Trojan War just so she could send him off to war and get rid of him. Anticleia might as well be right to blame Penelope, instead of Helen, for Odysseus' having to go to war. Odysseus pretends to have gone mad

25 Akgiin (2010) 37–38.

26 Irigaray (1985) 83.

to avoid keeping his promise and going to Troy to bring Helen back. Allegedly to show that Odysseus will not recognize her or their son and to prove her husband right, Penelope carries the baby Telemachus to the field. However, when Palamedes puts the baby in front of the plough Odysseus is driving, Odysseus stops the plough in order not to kill his son. Having his madman disguise ruined thanks to his wife, he has to go to war.

In *The Penelopiad* Penelope affirms that Odysseus and she have both admitted to be “proficient and shameless liars of long standing.”²⁷ They start playacting and using deceit on their first night as a married couple upon the suggestion of Odysseus. The bride is presumed to be stolen, while “the consummation of marriage was supposed to be a sanctioned rape ... a mock killing.”²⁸ Odysseus suggests that Penelope pretend to be hurt and scream to satisfy those listening outside their bedroom. It should be noted that he does steal Penelope and her dowry and take both to Ithaca after the wedding instead of living with his wife’s family in Sparta as the old custom requires. Furthermore, with the help of Tyndareus, Helen’s father and Penelope’s uncle, he cheats in the running competition for the hand of Penelope in marriage; he drugs his opponents who are competing. After Odysseus wins the contest, marries Penelope, and takes her to Ithaca, Tyndareus’ grandchildren will rule in Sparta.

Besides bringing Penelope and her dowry back to Ithaca thanks to his craftiness, Odysseus is also accused of being a usurper who overthrows the Great Mother cult. His refusal to be beheaded at the end of his rightful term and sacrificing the suitors and the maids as substitutes bears resemblance to “the Empire of the Selfsame” which is “erected from ... The fear of expropriation, of separation, of losing attribute. In other words, the threat of castration has an impact.”²⁹ Armstrong emphasizes that catastrophe and bloodshed are the central features of the myth of the dying vegetation gods. The ever-dying and ever-living god “epitomises a universal process, like the waxing and waning of the seasons”³⁰ and the moon. The god or his impersonator needs to die so that he can be reborn and fertilize the goddess to produce new crops.³¹ The maids in Atwood’s continuation play the role of the twelve moon-maidens of Artemis, the moon goddess, while Penelope plays the role of the High Priestess. After indulging in orgiastic fertility rite behavior with the suitors, the maids purify

27 Atwood (2005) 173.

28 Atwood (2005) 44.

29 Cixous and Clément (1996) 80.

30 Armstrong (2005) 53.

31 Coupe (1997) 24; Frazer (1978).

themselves in the blood of the murdered male victims, thereby renewing their virginity. Finally, as a re-enactment of the dark side of the moon phase, the maids sacrifice themselves.³²

Since agriculture is neither a peaceful nor a contemplative task, as Armstrong puts it, the Great Mother is not a gentle or consoling goddess.³³ In both the *Odyssey* and *The Penelopiad* the desire of a woman is portrayed as an “insatiable hunger, a voracity that will swallow you whole.”³⁴ Reminiscent of the Great Mother and Irigaray’s definition of the desire of a woman, Penelope, too, is regarded as a hazard to Odysseus’ life. Hence, Agamemnon’s warning and cautionary tale in Hades. The *Odyssey* ends with Odysseus’ reaffirming his manhood and kingship whereas *The Penelopiad* ends with a reclaiming of the matrilineal cult of the Great Mother, representing Penelope as the High Priestess and the maids as the priestesses of the moon goddess Artemis, and condemning Odysseus, the usurper, to an eternal punishment. Nancy Fraser maintains that “gender justice now encompasses issues of representation, identity, and difference.”³⁵ Accordingly, *The Penelopiad*, as a gendered continuation of the *Odyssey*, offers Helen, Penelope, and the twelve maids self-representation.

Almost all female figures in the original epic and in its continuation transgress the boundaries and dismantle the gender roles ascribed by the phallogocentric order. In addition, Froma I. Zeitlin asserts that in the *Odyssey* every female character provides for the building up of the conglomerate character of Penelope.³⁶ In Lacanian terms Penelope is “the reflector and guarantor of an apparent masculine subject position,”³⁷ that of Odysseus to be specific. She also serves as a point of reference for Odysseus whenever he encounters a woman, be she a human, a goddess, or a monster. In Homer’s epic Penelope’s loyalty to her husband is confirmed by numerous characters including Agamemnon, Anticleia, and Athena. In Atwood’s continuation Penelope accordingly claims that she is not a man-eater, a Siren, or a Helen, but she actually embodies in her character all human and non-human female figures of Homer’s epic who assist Odysseus, delay his *nostos*, homecoming, or threaten his life. As Heidi Slettedahl Macpherson mentions, Atwood, in her continuation, “even unpicks the apparent goodness of Penelope” to explore “the darker side of female (human)

32 Atwood (2005) 164.

33 Armstrong (2005) 48.

34 Irigaray (1985) 29.

35 Fraser (2013) 160.

36 Zeitlin (1996) 45.

37 Butler (2010) 61.

nature.”³⁸ Penelope is seemingly passive, patiently waiting for her husband to return home from war in the epic, but she is subverting the phallogocentric discourse as well as gender roles in the continuation. Athena bestows upon Penelope her skill in weaving, intelligence, and talent at rhetoric; and makes her look more beautiful not only to enthrall Odysseus but also to encourage the suitors to give her gifts. Therefore, in Homer’s epic, Penelope attributes her idea of the shroud to Athena and her idea of challenging the suitors to string her husband’s bow to Odysseus, whereas, in Atwood’s continuation, she explains that it was all her own idea, but that she reckoned that if she attributed it to a goddess, she would avoid being punished by gods, like Arachne was, because of her boasting and *hubris*.

Athena is the goddess of wisdom and war as well as spinning and weaving; she is the protector of heroes and the guardian of cities. Penelope, likewise, is known for her intelligence, weaving, and protecting the *oikos*. Just as Athena does not have a mother, so Penelope has an absentee mother and a cold and distant mother-in-law. Of all the Olympian deities, Athena alone is allowed to wear the aegis and carry the thunderbolt of her father Zeus. Similarly, Penelope is in charge of ruling the estates of Odysseus and is in possession of his bow after he leaves for Troy. Besides, the story of Athena’s turning Arachne into a spider after the latter hangs herself resembles the story of Penelope’s shroud, which was called “Penelope’s web”,³⁹ thereby associating Penelope with a spider aiming to catch the suitors like flies. Additionally, Penelope’s name etymologically means “thread.” In *The Penelopiad* Penelope does not appreciate the spider analogy and argues in her defense that she has been the one trying to avoid entanglement. She also notes that the suitors are furious not only because they are fooled, but because they are fooled by a woman. Therefore, she pretends not to have recognized her husband when he is disguised as an old beggar; she considers it “an imprudence to step between a man and the reflection of his own cleverness.”⁴⁰

As regards trickery and gender, Marilyn Jurich avers that since a woman is regarded as fragile and feeble-minded, hence incapable of forming a plot, she has “double impunity.”⁴¹ According to Jurich, women employ tricks in order to achieve social change by upending the codes of limitation and oppression.⁴² Penelope, however, reinforces the existing order and employs its codes

38 Macpherson (2010) 21.

39 Atwood (2005) 119.

40 Atwood (2005) 137.

41 Jurich (1998) 225.

42 Jurich (1998) 18–19.

to manipulate and oppress the maids, in that she professedly waits for the right moment to tell Odysseus about her twelve confidant maids, who have been following her orders, and causes them to be eventually hanged for their seeming disloyalty. This illustrates what Zajko calls Penelope's "self-conscious belatedness and awareness of the dynamics of appropriation and selection"⁴³ in *The Penelopiad*. Like Calypso conceals Odysseus in a cave on her island, Penelope conceals her cunning plans from the twelve maids as well as the suitors it seems. Just as Circe enchants Odysseus' companions with her singing and weaving, so Penelope weaves, whereas in Atwood's continuation her maids sing. Penelope is supposedly weaving a shroud for her father-in-law Laertes during the day, while at night she undoes her day's work with the help of her maids who also entertain themselves by singing, sharing jokes, and telling stories. Penelope's sweet talk to seduce the suitors as well as the maids' songs replace the Sirens' singing with their honey-sweet voices to seduce the sailors. Additionally, in the *Odyssey* Arete and Nausicaa play the roles of good wife and daughter, protecting the *oikos* while Ino saves Odysseus from drowning, as opposed to Helen and Clytemnestra who delineate the scale of turmoil a woman can cause by making a decision when her husband is away. Helen runs away with Paris and causes the Trojan War, which claims hundreds of thousands of lives. Clytemnestra plots with her lover the murder of her husband Agamemnon to avenge his sacrificing their daughter Iphigenia to be able to sail to Troy. In Hades Teiresias warns Odysseus against the suitors waiting in Ithaca, while Agamemnon tells his wife Clytemnestra's betrayal as a cautionary tale. Despite owning that Penelope is known for her loyalty, he still warns Odysseus against a possible similar betrayal on his return home. Having been warned in advance, Odysseus avenges himself on the suitors thanks to Athena, Telemachus, and Penelope. In the continuation, similar to Helen and Clytemnestra, Penelope is secretly attracted to rascals and has been flirting with the suitors while she plays the role of the patient and loyal wife who waits for her husband and protects the *oikos*.⁴⁴ According to some rumors, she has been sleeping with all of the suitors and has given birth to Pan. It is also noteworthy that Clytemnestra and Helen are Penelope's cousins. In other words, both Penelope and Odysseus have crafty and unscrupulous relatives. Odysseus' grandfather Autolycus is the son of Hermes, god of thieves and tricksters. It is also rumored that Odysseus' mother Anticleia has been unfaithful and that Odysseus' father is indeed Sisyphus, yet another crafty and deceitful figure. Fur-

43 Zajko (2008) 195.

44 See Akgün (2010) 38–39; Neethling (2015) 122.

thermore, Penelope reminds us of the sea monsters Scylla and Charybdis, for she brings about the death of her twelve maids as well as a hundred and twenty suitors.

The transformations and physical appearances of the goddesses and female monsters also underline women's transgression of boundaries. Circe transforms Odysseus' companions into pigs and eventually back into men only because she does not want to see Odysseus sad. Athena can transform herself into a man or a bird in the *Odyssey*. Athena makes Penelope look more beautiful before she meets Odysseus while she helps Odysseus put on the disguise of an old beggar and, when she takes off his disguise, makes him look more handsome. Scylla is a female sea monster with twelve feet, six long necks and heads, and three rows of teeth in each mouth, which enables her to devour six of Odysseus' companions at one go. Actually, Circe advises Odysseus to choose Scylla over Charybdis, yet another female sea monster, whose giant whirlpool would easily sink Odysseus' ship and kill everyone on it. The Sirens have the body of a bird and the head of a human woman. Penelope's Naiad mother reminds us of a sea monster, too: swimming around like a porpoise; eating raw fish, heads first, with her sharp pointed teeth; and suddenly killing an annoying maid in *The Penelopiad*. Moreover, at the end of the continuation, the maids invoke the Erinyes, "the dreaded Furies, snake-haired, dog-headed, bat-winged"⁴⁵ to haunt Odysseus while the maids themselves transform into owls, evocative of the Harpies, birds with faces of human women, fetching the wrongdoers to the Erinyes.

As another means of subversion, like Cixous and Bakhtin, Moi points out to the revolutionary attitude of laughter which overthrows the codes and norms of the established order and replaces them with new and slippery ones.⁴⁶ In Atwood's continuation, Helen, Penelope, and the maids laugh at the expense of others in celebration of their cunning, if small, acts of disobedience and rebellion. Helen has her "patronizing smirk."⁴⁷ Penelope confesses that when her father has begged her to stay in Sparta instead of going to Ithaca, she has pulled down her veil not because of her modesty, but to conceal her laughter. She also wants to giggle behind her veil, looking down at the short legs of Odysseus during their marriage ceremony. She laughs at the expense of the suitors with whom she flirts, encouraging them to give her expensive gifts to compensate for their expenses. Again, she silently laughs after tricking

45 Atwood (2005) 110.

46 Bakhtin (2000) 170; Cixous (1976) 888; Moi (1985) 40.

47 Atwood (2005) 34.

Eurycleia into almost revealing the identity of Odysseus when he is disguised as a beggar, by asking her to wash his feet so that she can behold his scar. Much to Penelope's amusement, Odysseus almost throttles his old nurse to stop her from revealing his identity. As for the maids, they laugh and giggle while working in the outbuildings. Becoming "polished and evasive", they master "the secret sneer";⁴⁸ they spit in the food they serve, drink the leftover wine, and steal meat. Penelope's letting Odysseus and Telemachus hang the maids might be her way of finally making them stop laughing at her, since she often complains that she could not stop the maids laughing at her expense. As a matter of fact, Penelope's mother could suddenly kill a maid who has happened to annoy her as well. Besides, Penelope does not even feel sorry when the maid she brought from Sparta dies—not for the maid at least. She only resents the fact that she is left alone in a strange land among strange people.

Towards the end of Homer's epic, Odysseus, disguised as an old beggar, praises Penelope by comparing her to a benevolent king who maintains fertility and order in his kingdom. At the end of *The Penelopiad* the maids' narrative suggests that just as Odysseus has restored order and reaffirmed his manhood and kingship by murdering all the suitors, so Penelope has maintained her reputation as a patient and loyal wife at the expense of the maids. As if to draw attention to this parallelism, in the continuation, the maids perform a sea shanty in sailor costumes impersonating Odysseus' companions and singing about their adventures. They also sing a rope-jumping rhyme about Odysseus' and Telemachus' killing and Penelope's failing them; they claim that they are rendered weak and silent whereas their master and mistress have the spear (power) and the word (official epic singing their praises). Penelope, likewise, believes that the geese she is feeding in her dream before an eagle comes and kills them represent not the suitors but her maids. In the meantime, Penelope does nothing to protect the geese (the maids) from the eagle (Odysseus). Furthermore, in the epic, Penelope claims that Helen would not have run away with Paris if she had known that the Achaeans would bring her back, which is regarded as Penelope's "unconscious vindication of what we do not know (will never know) with regard to Penelope herself."⁴⁹ Correspondingly, in Atwood's continuation, the maids claim that Penelope has been sleeping with the suitors and that that's why she begs Eurycleia to have Odysseus kill the twelve maids who are privy to her secrets. The maids mourn that dirt is both their specialty and fault, in that they are Penelope's source of information and gossip, but,

48 Atwood (2005) 14.

49 Zeitlin (1995) 144.

at the same time, their knowledge poses a threat for Penelope. Given that Penelope excels at deceit and has managed to fool even Athena and Odysseus with her seeming modesty and loyalty respectively, the maids might as well be telling the truth about her affairs. After all, Penelope concurs that she finds it delightful “to combine obedience and disobedience in the same act.”⁵⁰ She also admits that she has enjoyed flirting with the suitors; she has encouraged them and sent secrets messages to them, and has even daydreamed about with which one she would rather sleep.

Homer’s epic opens with an emphasis on the fact that Odysseus’ companions have died of their own foolish acts, no matter how hard Odysseus has tried to save them. Nevertheless, Odysseus’ being the only one who returns home does not necessarily praise his leadership or display his bravery and prowess. Nor does it prove that his *metis*, cunning, and resourcefulness can indeed be regarded as heroic qualities. Until Elpenor’s spirit in Hades asks Odysseus and his companions to go back to Circe’s island and bury his body properly, he has not even noticed that they have left behind one of his men when they have sailed away from that island, let alone that Elpenor has died. Also, Odysseus keeps his companions in the dark about the advice, instructions, and gifts given to him by their hosts and hostesses to protect themselves against the challenges awaiting them throughout their *nostos*. He takes Circe’s advice and chooses to sacrifice six of his companions to Scylla without telling his companions about the monsters or his decision. Likewise, he only warns them not to touch Aeolus’ gift instead of telling them what it really is. His companions think that Odysseus is not willing to share the guest gifts. They open the bag of winds to see what is inside and set all the winds free, which takes them back to Aeolus’ land and prolongs their *nostos* right when they have got so close to the end of their journey that they could see Ithaca. Being asleep is the excuse of Odysseus for not preventing his companions from committing foolish acts, such as opening the bag of winds and eating the golden flock of Apollo. He is once again asleep when he arrives in Ithaca and when the Phaeacians leave him and his guest gifts on the shore. Likewise, in the continuation Penelope claims that Eurycleia must have put some sleeping draught in her drink to comfort her and make her sleep throughout the murder of the suitors and the maids. When Odysseus eventually returns to Ithaca, he has no companions left alive to bear witness to or to contradict his tales of *nostos*. In other words, as some critics believe,⁵¹ Odysseus’ narrative, his heroic self-revelation,

50 Atwood (2005) 117.

51 See Doherty (2003) 142; Attebery (2014) 38.

may be mere lies. Accordingly, like Odysseus' self-proclaimed heroism, his life-threatening adventures with sea monsters and goddesses are diminished to drunken mutinies, tavern fights, ear-bitings, nosebleeds, stabbings, eviscerations, expensive whorehouses, and a cave full of bats in Atwood's continuation. Similarly, in the epic, Penelope has no confidant maids left alive to contradict her tales of how she has remained loyal to Odysseus. In the continuation, however, as mentioned above, the twelve maids' narrative contradicts not only the epic, but also Penelope's retelling in the continuation.

The *homophrosynē*, like-mindedness, of Penelope and Odysseus in the epic is appropriated in the continuation to bend gender roles, to deconstruct the binary oppositions of masculinity and femininity, and to show their artificiality by ascribing the same qualities to both male and female figures. Odysseus, like Penelope, embodies most of the life-threatening qualities of the female figures he encounters during his *nostos*. As Penelope notes, like Circe, the Sirens, and Calypso, he is "a persuader", and "an excellent raconteur" with "a wonderful ... deep and sonorous" voice.⁵² Not to mention his disguises, cunning devices, and plans. The strongest weapon of Odysseus and Penelope is their wits. Among their specialties are making a fool of everyone and getting away with it, although Penelope projects the latter onto Helen. Yet another resemblance between Odysseus and Penelope is their excessive weeping and slipperiness. Odysseus cannot hold back his tears while listening to the bard at Alcinous' court sing about the Trojan War. Also, on Calypso's island, he spends most of his time sitting on a rock, gazing towards Ithaca, and weeping. Both Odysseus and Telemachus cry a lot when they are reunited after twenty years. Odysseus cries again when he holds his wife at the end of the epic. As for Penelope, being the daughter of a Naiad, she is "well connected among the fish and seabirds."⁵³ Water is her element and birthright whereas excessive weeping is her handicap. Penelope confesses in the continuation that she often lies down on her bed and cries. Additionally, as discussed above, she is reminiscent of the nonhuman female figures who are, in a manner, personifications of the sea and pose a danger of being concealed (Calypso, Circe, and even Nausicaa), swallowed (Scylla), engulfed, or obliterated (Charybdis)⁵⁴ for Odysseus and his companions during their *nostos*. As numerous mythologies do, Cixous deems water as the feminine element whereas Moi claims that mimicking the phallogocentric discourse's equation between woman and fluids only strengthens

52 Atwood (2005) 45.

53 Atwood (2005) 9.

54 Schein (1995) 19; Doherty (2003) 162.

that discourse. Irigaray, on the contrary, compares woman's language to fluids, in that both are continuous, endless, compressible, and dilatable at the same time.⁵⁵ Likewise, in the continuation, heeding her mother's one good piece of advice, Penelope tries to behave like water instead of opposing the suitors. She embraces her fluidity and employs "the feminine resource of evasiveness"⁵⁶ to keep the suitors waiting for her decision.

The narrative of the maids is similarly fluid, mercurial, and permutable. The intertwined chapters narrated by Penelope and the maids in turns, but not in any particular order, bring to mind weaving as well. Moreover, these intertwined chapters delineate how the phallogocentric order allows a woman to experience herself "only fragmentarily, in the little-structured margins of a dominant ideology, as waste, or excess."⁵⁷ The chapters narrated by the maids are titled "The Chorus Line", but each chapter also has a subtitle indicating its genre. The maids narrate each chapter using a different genre from a rope-jumping rhyme to an anthropology lecture to a court trial videotape. In addition to the constantly changing genre, "sweeping away syntax"⁵⁸ and disposing of capitalization and punctuation celebrate chaos, diversity, and what Cixous calls a new, feminine language that ceaselessly capsizes phallogocentrism. Moi argues that masculine rationality favors reason, order, and unity over irrationality, chaos, and fragmentation, which it associates with femininity and silences and excludes.⁵⁹ The maids' telling of their story chapter by chapter, each chapter written in a different genre and thus exhausting the male discourse as well as order, is suggestive of Irigaray's claim that it is futile to try to trap women in an exact definition in any "discursive machinery."⁶⁰ What is more, the narrative of the maids is the return of the repressed, which, according to Cixous, is "an explosive, *utterly* destructive, staggering return, with a force never yet unleashed."⁶¹

As far as Moi is concerned, feminism not only rejects but also transforms power.⁶² In Atwood's continuation, the male judge, representing the phallogocentric order, accepts Homer's epic as "the main authority on the subject"⁶³

55 Cf. Moi (1985) 117, 142 and Irigaray (1985) 111.

56 Spacks (1976) 24.

57 Irigaray (1985) 30.

58 Cixous (1976) 886.

59 Moi (1985) 160.

60 Irigaray (1985) 29.

61 Cixous (1976) 886.

62 Moi (1985) 148.

63 Atwood (2005) 179.

and dismisses the case during the trial of Odysseus not to be guilty of anachronism. Then, the twelve maids condemn Odysseus to an eternal punishment, like the ones given to Sisyphus and Tantalus in Hades. An eternal punishment from which neither the patronage of Athena nor his many ways can save him. Actually, Odysseus' punishment as well as his crime is a poetic reflection of his name, which means "he who receives and inflicts pain." The victimizer of the epic is transformed into the victim in the continuation. In the continuation Odysseus has a much worse fate than those of Achilles and Agamemnon who envy him in the epic. Just as Poseidon does in the *Odyssey*, so the Erinyes and the maids haunt Odysseus in *The Penelopiad*. In the epic, in order to make peace with Poseidon, who prolongs and makes Odysseus' *nostos* fatally hazardous because he has blinded the god's son Polyphemus the Cyclops, Odysseus has to leave home one last time to go to the innermost land and introduce the god of the sea to the people who have not even heard of the sea. In the continuation he is doomed to be an eternal wanderer. The Erinyes, assuming the appearance of the corpses of the maids, alongside the maids in the form of owls, will haunt Odysseus "on earth or in Hades, wherever he may take refuge, in songs and in plays, in tomes and in theses, in marginal notes and in appendices!"⁶⁴ No matter how many times Odysseus is reborn, in every single one of his lives, he always dies a horrible death, be it a suicide, an accident, a death in battle, or an assassination, which reflects Penelope's dreams in which the adventures of Odysseus during his *nostos* end in gruesome demises, with the Cyclops bashing his head and eating his brains or the Sirens tearing him apart with their birds' claws. Atwood, consequently, does not only reject Homer's authority on the subject in her gendered continuation, but also dismantles the patriarchal discourse and order, embodied by the epic as well as its hero, of any power whatsoever by providing the narratives of Penelope and the maids, the heretofore silenced and repressed characters.

Bibliography

- Akgün, B. (2010) "The Penelopiad: Dislodging the Myth of Penelope as the Archetype of Faithful and Patient Wife", in Güzel, Alkan, Küçükboyacı, and Çakar (2010) 36–42.
- Allen, A. (2008) *The Politics of Our Selves: Power, Autonomy, and Gender in Contemporary Critical Theory*. New York.
- Armstrong, K. (2005) *A Short History of Myth*. Edinburgh.

64 Atwood (2005) 183.

- Attebery, B. (2014) *Stories About Stories: Fantasy and the Remaking of Myth*. New York.
- Atwood, M. (2005) *The Penelopiad*. Edinburgh.
- Bakhtin, M.M. (2000) *The Dialogic Imagination: Four Essays*. Austin.
- Benhabib, S., Butler, J., Cornell, D., and Fraser, N. (1995) *Feminist Contentions: A Philosophical Exchange*. New York.
- Bernabé, A. and Jiménez San Cristóbal, A.I. (2008) *Instructions for the Netherworld: The Orphic Gold Tablets*. Leiden.
- Burnett, L., Bahun, S., and Main, R. (eds) (2013) *Myth, Literature, and the Unconscious*. London.
- Butler, J. (1995) "Burning Acts—Injurious speech", in Parker and Sedgwick (1995) 197–227.
- Butler, J. (2004) *Undoing Gender*. New York.
- Butler, J. (2010) *Gender Trouble: Feminism and Subversion of Identity*. New York.
- Buxton, R. (2013) *Myths and Tragedies in their Ancient Greek Contexts*. Oxford.
- Campbell, J. (1991) *The Masks of God: Occidental Mythology*. New York.
- Cixous, H. (1976) "The Laugh of the Medusa", *Signs* 1: 875–893.
- Cixous, H. and Clément C. (1996) *The Newly Born Woman*. London.
- Cohen, B. (ed) (1995) *The Distaff Side: Representing the Female in Homer's Odyssey*. New York.
- Coupe, L. (1997) *Myth*. London.
- Doherty, L.E. (2003) *Gender and the Interpretation of Classical Myth*. London.
- Doherty, L.E. (1995) "Sirens, Muses and Female Narrators in the *Odyssey*", in Cohen (1995) 81–92.
- Feldherr, A. (2010) *Playing Gods: Ovid's Metamorphoses and the Politics of Fiction*. Princeton.
- Fraser, N. (2013) *Fortunes of Feminism: From State-Managed Capitalism to Neoliberal Crisis*. London.
- Frazer, J. (1978) *The Illustrated Golden Bough*. London.
- Güzel, N.S., Alkan, B., Küçükboyacı, U.E., and Çakar, E. (eds) (2010) *Fourth International IDEA Conference, 15–17 April 2009: Book of Proceedings*. Manisa.
- Hardwick, L. and Stray, C. (eds) (2008) *A Companion to Classical Receptions*. Malden.
- Irigaray, L. (1985) *This Sex Which Is Not One*. New York.
- Johnson, A.G. (2005) *The Gender Knot: Unraveling Our Patriarchal Legacy*. Philadelphia.
- Jurich, M. (1998) *Scheherazade's Sisters: Trickster Heroines and Their Stories in World Literature*. Westport, CT.
- Keen, S. (1991) *Fire in the Belly: On Being a Man*. New York.
- Kolodny, A. (1975) "Some Notes on Defining a 'Feminist Literary Criticism'", *Critical Inquiry* 2: 75–92.
- Macpherson, H.S. (2010) *The Cambridge Introduction to Margaret Atwood*. Cambridge.
- Moi, T. (1985) *Sexual/Textual Politics: Feminist Literary Theory*. London.

- Murnaghan, S. (1987) "Penelope's Agnoia: Knowledge, Power and Gender in the *Odyssey*", in Skinner (1987) 103–115.
- Neethling, G. (2015) "Margaret Atwood's exploration of Homer's Penelope in her novella *The Penelopiad*", *English Academy Review* 32.2: 115–131.
- Parker, A. and Sedgwick E.K. (eds) (1995) *Performativity and Performance*. New York.
- Schein, S.L. (1995) "Female Representations and Interpreting the *Odyssey*", in Cohen (1995) 17–27.
- Segal, R.A. (2013) "Freudian and Jungian approaches to myth: the similarities", in Burnett, Bahun, and Main (2013) 101–119.
- Sempruch, J. (2008) *Fantasies of Gender and the Witch in Feminist Theory and Literature*. Indiana.
- Skinner, M. (ed) (1987) *Rescuing Creusa: New Methodological Approaches to Women in Antiquity*. *Helios* 13.2.
- Spacks, P.A.M. (1976) *The Female Imagination: A Literary and Psychological Investigation of Women's Writing*. London.
- Speer, S.A. (2005) *Gender Talk: Feminism, Discourse and Conversation Analysis*. London.
- Zajko, V. (2008) "'What Difference Was Made?': Feminist Models of Reception", in Hardwick and Stray (2008) 195–206.
- Zeitlin, F.I. (1995) "Figuring Fidelity in Homer's *Odyssey*", in Cohen (1995) 117–152.
- Zeitlin, F.I. (1996) *Playing the Other: Gender and Society in Classical Greek Literature*. Chicago.

PART 2

Beyond Troy and Homer



Squaring the Epic Cycle: Ovid's Rewriting of the Epic Tradition in the *Metamorphoses*

Marie Louise von Glinski

If one trusts Horace's advice in the *Ars Poetica*, writing epic is mostly a matter of starting out on the right foot. He warns: *Nec sic incipies, ut scriptor cyclicus olim: / Fortunam Priami cantabo et nobile bellum* ("Do not start thus, like a cyclic writer once: 'I will sing about Priam's fate and the famous war'", *Ars P.* 136–137). The cyclic poet aims at totality and fails. The impulse towards telling the whole story, inherent in the epic claim itself, characterizes especially those who are seen to complete the Homeric poems, the poets of the epic cycle.¹ If one considers Ovid's epic continuations, the problem lies less in how than where to begin. The *Heroides* spring to mind as the model continuation in the margins of Trojan epics. They present not only an explicit hypertext but one in a lesser genre, epistolography; their style is that of elegiac decline (hexameter to pentameter, male to female voice); and their marginality is emphasized by the moments chosen as the dramatic setting for the letters. These letters are (mostly) one-offs without continuity; their role as dead ends in a hypothetical side development of the mainstream thus marks their impotence as potential hypotexts in their own right.² Similar sideways entrances into the tradition of the Trojan epics can be detected throughout the Ovidian corpus, such as the trip to Rome by Dido's sister Anna in the *Fasti* (*Fast.* 3.545–656). Ovid's entire corpus should therefore be considered a complex matrix of continuations. For the purposes of this chapter, however, epic continuation will be limited to Ovid's epic poem.

In writing the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid naturally asserts himself as the epic successor of Virgil, yet the poem occupies a slant position to the epic tradition itself, more akin to commentary than continuation. Most noticeably, Ovid disrupts the epic tradition by dispensing with a central character or plot. This results in multiple continuations that themselves will merge into the overall layout of the poem (e.g. *Argonautica*, *Thebaid*, *Perseid*). While the *Metamorphoses* contain epic plot elements (such as the founding or the fall of cities,

1 Genette (1997) 177–181. The relation of the epic cycle and Homer is subject of considerable scholarly debate, see Burgess (2001). For the Roman context in this chapter, the negative view of the cyclic poets from Aristotle onward has greater relevance.

2 Genette's terms (1997) 5 and n. 13.

journeys and heroic exploits), none dominates the poem as a whole. Instead, metamorphosis is a deliberately universal theme; one that Ovid enjoys tracing and amplifying in dealing with his predecessors and whose constant permutations mark his approach to their works.³

The *Metamorphoses* frequently foreground the concept of continuation. The poem presents a universal cycle, from the beginning of time down to the poet's own (*ad mea tempora*, *Met.* 1.4), in a deliberately unstable amalgam of episodes. The famous paradox of writing a *carmen* that is both *perpetuum* (continuous) and *deductum* (finely wrought) applies especially to Ovid's integration of Virgil and Homer in his poem, whittling down their epics and making them continuous. This chapter discusses Ovid's engagement with the epic cycle in relation to Virgil and Homer in the so-called "Little *Iliad*" (*Met.* 12.1–13.622) and "Little *Aeneid*" (*Met.* 13.623–14.582) sections of the poem.⁴ Ovid does more than drawing on the epic cycle for source material: he also leverages the criticism of the epic cycle as epigonal and inferior in formulating his own role in literary history. Ovid does in fact claim the universality of Horace's cyclic poet—but he does not begin at the beginning.

At first sight, however, the *Metamorphoses* reject continuation. The beginning of the poem assertively declares its independence from tradition: *In nova fert animus mutatas dicere formas / corpora* ("My mind brings me to speak of forms changed into new bodies", *Met.* 1.1–2). The emphasis lies heavily on innovation, even in the act of beginning twice over after a proem that labours under the mass of intertextual allusions. Ovid thus pointedly violates the Horatian dictum of starting *in medias res* (*Ars P.* 148). In terms of both the narrative and his role as epic poet, Ovid positions himself as a prequel to Virgil and Homer.

Continuation stands in obvious relation to the closure of a previous work. Ovid's predecessor Virgil presents a notoriously difficult example in the death of Turnus as the end of his poem. As Hardie has demonstrated, death, while a seemingly natural stopping point, may not be sufficient for closure, marking the *Aeneid's* last scene as a truncated, premature ending.⁵ In both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, the death of Hector and the suitors, respectively, is resolved through ritual. Virgil also closes with death, but not with ritual. His deliberate

3 Myers (1994) 100 observes that Ovid repeats stories from the *Aeneid* when they involve metamorphosis.

4 For extensive treatment of these sections and secondary literature see Papaioannou (2005) and (2007). Rosati (2015) discusses more generally Ovid's proximity to the epic cycle in both the content and the style of the *Metamorphoses*.

5 Hardie (1997) 142–151.

openness in closure hints at continuation, yet in employing a multi-layered symbolic time-scheme, Virgil both anticipates and precludes continuation. Aeneas' anger at the end looks back on Juno's anger at the beginning, and looks forward at the same time, hinting at an eternal series of such loops throughout Roman history. Virgil's implicit challenge lies in continuing this new Roman epic, not, as he himself has done, in continuing the Trojan cycle.⁶ We shall look at this challenge later; for now, let us turn to Virgil's choice of a beginning as a model for Ovid.

Virgil's own continuation begins in the margins of the epic cycle. Continuation is logically located at the beginning, since it undoes the closure of a previous work. Thus Virgil begins with the epic cycle material of Troy in both the mural and in Aeneas' narrative, marking this material as imitative through the emphasis on representation while Aeneas' subjective reception integrates the events in the new poem. The events are not narrated but "performed" through the character. Aeneas' involvement ratifies the fictional truth of these events through an actual eye-witness account. Virgil thus incorporates epic cycle material into the *Aeneid*, a strategy that announces his own poem as a start of a new Roman epic cycle, as both Hardie and Barchiesi have suggested.⁷

In using the epic cycle, Virgil had broken the ban of writing epic by deliberately marking his epigonal position to Homer. Virgil's inclusion of the epic cycle connects the original Homeric poems to his own but inverts the position of the epic cycle material to being the prequel of the new Roman cycle. The catharsis of Books 2 and 3 of the *Aeneid* makes possible the *maius opus* that rivals Homer, a complete paradigm shift. Its effect must have been both liberating and paralyzing. Virgil had shown that it was possible to write epic to equal Homer, but the monumental impact of his achievement meant that it was also equally daunting to continue the *Aeneid*.⁸

Instead of picking up where Virgil left off, Ovid positions an overt continuation only in his last four books, that is, his gesture of continuation is one of closure, not beginning.⁹ Nor does he significantly advance historically beyond the end of the *Aeneid*, as the intervening years between Aeneas and Augustus are treated summarily. In reintroducing, although not adhering too closely to, an annalistic timeline, Ovid untangles the simultaneity of time in Virgil. His

6 Hardie (1993) 12; Hardie (1997) 142. The Trojans are by name extinct (*Aen.* 12.828).

7 Barchiesi (1999) 334–335; Hardie (2012) 143–144.

8 Tarrant (1997) 60–63.

9 See also Hardie (1993) 13 on Ovid beginning his *last* book with the speech of Pythagoras which recalls Ennius' beginning his *first* book with the speech of Homer.

intention is not to continue, but to integrate the *Aeneid* and, for that matter, the Homeric poems in his poem. Thus the key to Ovid's approach lies in undoing closure, both on the level of poetics and in questioning the idea of mortality as defining the human condition, as we shall see.

By using the Trojan cycle, Ovid achieves a continuity of literary history which combines Homeric, cyclic, and Virgilian material, compounded with variations of the same in related genres. The impact of this intense reference creates a diptych of Homer and Virgil. Virgil is referenced as a continuation in the style of the epic cycle, a history which allows for only the *Iliad* as untouchable hypotext, while the *Aeneid* and *Odyssey* compete in quasi-contemporary doubles. Most notably this comes out in the roles of doubling the Virgilian Achaemenides and the Ovidian Macareus as twin footnotes to the *Odyssey* (*Met.* 14.154–440). By contrast, Ovid pointedly avoids further characterization of the Virgilian Dido, alluding by omission simultaneously to the Virgilian original and his own continuation in *Heroides* seven (*Met.* 14.78–81).¹⁰ Virgil is a model of continuation for his own continuator Ovid.

Ovid's beginning of the end at the threshold of the significant Book 12 marks the beginning of literature when his poem is more than two-thirds done, with Homer (the origin) and Virgil (the last successor) as monumental cornerstones.¹¹ Ovid's closural continuation thus constricts the authors to simultaneity. Troy makes Homer, Virgil and Ovid contemporaries as the poem accelerates to the *telos* of Ovid's survival in literary history. In incorporating his own persona in this concept of literary generations, Ovid lays claim to being counted as equal and logical successor to Virgil. The analogy of fathers outdone by their sons, ostensibly directed at Augustus, may be read equally well as the assertive declaration of Ovid's status versus the established poets (*Met.* 15.855–858).

The Curse of the Epic Cycle

Ovid's engagement with these authors is marked by an undercurrent of meta-poetics and philological commentary. Ovid conceptualizes continuation in a variety of ways, changing temporal, spatial and subjective perspectives. Despite the increasing teleological design of these last books as closural strategy, Ovid frequently disrupts inherent sequences, such as the Roman king list (*Met.* 14.623, resumed at 14.772); at other times he deliberately upsets the order of

10 See Miller (2004).

11 The final episode of book eleven is located on the Trojan periphery (*Met.* 11.749).

literary history to maintain a strict mythical sequence, the bucolic Polyphemus of Theocritus/*Eclogues* before the epic version of the *Odyssey*/*Aeneid* (*Met.* 13.740–884; 14.160–220).¹²

The poets of the epic cycle are considered by Aristotle as inferior to Homer (Aristotle *Poetics* 1459a30–b2). The negative assessment was passed down through Callimachus (*Epigr.* 28 Pfeiffer) and Horace (*Ars P.* 136–142) as a topos of literary criticism.¹³ The main offense seems to be a lack of selectivity, a negative mirror of Homer's most praised quality. In a much-debated article, Griffin attempted to define the uniqueness of Homer and pointed to the radical choice of the *Iliad* in the recognition of the human condition as mortal. The epic cycle instead is characterized by magic, immortality, and a proliferation of intrigues to the end that "all the outlines are blurred."¹⁴ While the relation of the epic cycle to the Homeric poems is now being reassessed, at least the ancient reception of the epic cycle seems to put the cycle in relation to Homer, and find it inferior.¹⁵

The central moral question of the *Iliad* is the condition of mortality, most notably in the encounter of Thetis and Achilles. As Griffin noted, the epic cycle is considerably more flexible on this question: "Even more, in the accommodating world of the Cycle, death itself can be evaded."¹⁶ The obvious metapoetic connotations of death in relation to closure make its undoing a powerful trope of continuation. The *Aeneid* is not merely the story of continuation of Homer, or a generational story between poets, but also a continuation of heroes. Aeneas escapes the end of the Trojan fighting through magical means and has to reassert his moral and political authority throughout the new poem, transforming the continuation into a new hypotext. At the cyclic beginning of the *Aeneid*, he is the lateral survivor in a house that has no survivors; at the end, his death, like Achilles', is implied through the death of his opponent. Ovid's deliberate inclusion of cyclic material at the end of the poem inverts this customary association. He ends *in mediis rebus*, after a line of apotheoses that suggests the possibility of continuing beyond death.

12 Even though correct chronological order is maintained in reference to Virgil's work (*Eclogues* before *Aeneid*).

13 Cameron (1995) 387–412.

14 Griffin (1977) 43.

15 Burgess (2001) 167 rightly points out that the concept of immortality should not be used to establish a relative date for the epic cycle. In what follows, I argue merely for examining the concept as a reaction to Homer's *Iliad* in Virgil and Ovid, that is the perception of the cyclic poems as later continuations.

16 Griffin (1977) 42.

This issue will be examined in the context of three pairs of action and poetic commemoration that exemplify survival through poetry: Achilles and Nestor in Book 12, Aeneas and the Sibyl in Book 14, and Ovid and Augustus in Book 15. Ovid's continuation works in the context of his poem in connecting the Trojan epics and their reception in one continuous narrative. This erases the boundary lines of previous epics, such as the death of Hector or Turnus. There, the death of the opponent was emphasized as the inevitable biological end, while poetic immortality was the reward for a life of glorious warrior in the *Iliad*, or the promise of a bright future for one's descendants in the *Aeneid*. Ovid deconstructs the image of immortality traditionally advanced by the epics of duality, since metamorphosis introduces the epic cycle element of magic. We shall see how this magic disables Homeric notions of heroic valor, calls into question the notion of supra-personal survival in the *Aeneid*, and finally leads to the competitive claim at immortality between the poet and Augustus. The end starkly coincides with a reminder of both the poet's and the emperor's mortality.

Living to Tell the Tale

Ovid's engagement with Homer's *Iliad* foregrounds the history of the 'failed' continuators of the epic cycle. The focus thus lies less on the considerable use of the epic source material than on the telling of it. Ovid does not start with a prequel that "causes" the *Iliad*, such as the choice of Paris. His entry in the Trojan cycle is oblique, through the seemingly random association of an anonymous speaker, as if to diminish the claim of authorship (*proximus, aut idem, si fors tulit, "hic quoque" dixit*, "The next one, or maybe the same, said: 'He, too ...'", *Met.* 11.751). The aition of Aesacus marks the first death of the Trojans, a love story that pointedly replays the Apollo and Daphne episode at the beginning of Ovid's poem. (*Met.* 11.749–795; 1.452–567). By recycling the pursuit Ovid configures himself as prior, a move that is as epigonal as it is assertive. Continuations may be sequential or anterior in relation to the hypotext; asserting at least temporal priority in terms of narratives contradicts the historical reality of "coming after."¹⁷ The effect here is that the *Metamorphoses* draw to a close, repetition being a closural gesture, before the Trojan war, a famous *terminus post quem*, begins.

17 Genette (1997) 177.

The inversion of beginning and end also applies to the figure of Priam mourning for a son who is not dead, an absent presence (*Met.* 12.1–3).¹⁸ Hector's death in the *Iliad* prefigures the fall of Troy; here, Priam's premature mourning enhances the feeling that the significant events are still anticipated. Aesacus is associated with the marginal, he is a child born in secret in the shadows of Mount Ida (*Met.* 11.762–763). He is a mountain dweller and thus represents an un-urban Trojan (*Met.* 11.766). In this he is a double of Ovid's pre-Trojan, bucolic Paris in *Heroides* 1. His pursuit of Hesperia, reminiscent of Orpheus and Eurydice, associates an erotic topos with Troy at the same time that it anticipates the flight of Hector from Achilles.¹⁹ After causing the death of Hesperia, he attempts to kill himself but is transformed by Tethys into a bird.

Instead of following the stark duality of the *Iliad*, Ovid opens his Trojan cycle by subverting the Homeric values. Aesacus did not really care to win (*nec erat mihi vincere tanti*, 779), at least not at the prize of death; there is no winner or loser (*perdidimus nos te duo*, “we lost you both”, 780); his attempted suicide is averted in favor of limbo-like metamorphosis, and that by Tethys, grandmother to Thetis who is associated in the *Iliad* with the human condition. This overture emphasizes the marginal nature of the story: an amorous episode of a minor character, related to the hypotext; use of magic in order to continue life; and a plot that does not affect the Iliadic action or the world at large and ends without achieving closure (*letique viam sine fine retemptat*, “he tries endlessly the path to death”, 792).

The beginning of Book 12 is then deliberately set off to mark discontinuation: *nescius* (not knowing) is the first word of the book that contains the most well-known of all stories. A cenotaph prefigures the mountains of dead of the Trojan war (*Met.* 12.2–3); Iphigenia's body is hidden by a cloud (12.32); Cycnus will disappear (12.144); and Achilles' body will be reduced to a tiny amount of dust (12.616). In place of the *Iliad*'s insistence of bodies slaughtered in individual anatomical detail, Ovid's series of parentheses signal absence and uncertainty.

This accords with the macro-scale of Ovid's engagement with Homer through studiously avoiding any action told in the *Iliad*; to repeat Homer is the mark of the dilettante, but to supplement Homer is ultimately unsatisfying since, by definition, the events of any real significance are fixed and covered by the *Iliad*. Ovid follows the epic cycle sequence but deliberately omits the

18 Hardie (2002) 85–87.

19 Note the relative chronology which once again makes Ovid “prior” to Homer.

Iliadic center around which these poems orbit.²⁰ Thus the *Iliad* is described by its absence, its *horror vacui* disabling any possible martial action.²¹ The frustration that results proves the elusivity of the *Iliad* as a literary model.

Ovid matches Achilles and Nestor against each other as epic protagonists in an epic whose rules have changed.²² After Achilles' frustrating encounter with the invincible Cynus, Nestor recalls a similar fight in his youth against Caeneus. The Iliadic Nestor had mentioned him in a typical paranarrative parainesis (*Il.* 1.262–272; Caeneus 264), on which the Ovidian Nestor now expands. Unlike the Iliadic portrayal of Nestor who alludes to a lost grandeur of pre-Iliadic fighting, the *Metamorphoses* actually contain the objective narrative record of Nestor's rather feeble exploits in Book 8. He survived the Calydonian boar by jumping in a tree (*Met.* 8.365–368). While Nestor in the *Iliad* uses his rhetoric to urge Achilles unsuccessfully to engage in battle, Ovid's Nestor entertains the troops at a lull in the action (*Met.* 12.146–147). Thus Ovid captures the paradox of the *Iliad*'s combination of battle and abstinence. Until Book 20 of the *Iliad*, Achilles does not engage in battle, and even then is frustrated by his abbreviated encounters with Aeneas and Hector. In showing an unsuccessful Achilles, Ovid essentially skips the final books of the *Iliad* that define Achilles through his martial action.

The Ovidian Achilles is defined instead by his dubious exploits against Cynus. In the *Iliad*, the deaths of Patroclus as well as Hector function as a reminder and anticipation of Achilles' own death, which lies outside the action told in the *Iliad*. In the *Metamorphoses*, Achilles' adversary remains possibly alive through magic,²³ while it is Achilles' death, not Hector's, that signals the end of the martial action (597–606). Ovid's Apollo Smintheus (*Met.* 12.585), evoking the beginning of the *Iliad* (*Il.* 1.39), points to the radical abbreviation that makes Achilles' death the only significant, successful martial action of the

20 *Cypria*, [*Iliad*], *Aethiopsis*, *Ilias parva*, *Ilioupersis*.

21 At *Met.* 12.75 Hector is mentioned as being spared until the tenth year (*decimum dilatus in annum/Hector erat*) in favor of Cynus. After Achilles' inconclusive encounter with the latter, there is a break of a few days (146) and Nestor tells the story of the Lapiths and the Centaurs, after which they go to bed (579). Five lines later the war is said to have dragged on for almost ten years (584).

22 See von Glinski (2012), 103–114.

23 *Met.* 12.150 *Cycni victor Achilles* ("Achilles, winner over Cynus") but *Met.* 12.166–167 *iuvēnis corpus ... / invictum a vulnere erat*. ("The body of the youth was unvanquished by any wound.") Cf Ennius (513 Skutsch) *Qui vincit non est victor nisi victus fatetur*. ("He who wins is not a winner unless the loser concedes it.")

Trojan war.²⁴ Apollo Smintheus' identity as mousekiller may even ironically allude to Ovid's inflated, cyclic, preamble to this moment after a conspicuous time-gap: *Quid dignum tanto feret hic promissor hiatu? / parturient montes, nascetur ridiculus mus* ("What worthy thing will this promiser deliver after such a gape? Mountains will strain in labor and a funny little mouse will be born", *Ars P.* 139–140). Yet Achilles influences the discourse even after his death; his ashes, name, empty armor, and ghost all dominate the later episodes. Achilles' survival after death is thus proportionally more significant than his actual fighting. Ovid disables the significance of death in the *Iliad* by refusing closure.²⁵

Ovid's reception of the epic cycle is deliberately inclusive. The random episodic nature and the diverse fates of multiple minor characters in the cycle suit his own poem. Ovid thus does not only reference Homer as a text but Homer as a tradition. The hydra of possible narratives connected to the Trojan wars is allowed to grow rampant while its Iliadic center is marked as a white spot. This contrast extends to the Homeric characters as doubles. Nestor's doubling narrative tops Achilles' frustrating exploit;²⁶ even Achilles' projected double, his ghost (*imago*), is more successful in killing than the original. The survival of literary characters in continuations undoes the usual boundary of human mortality. Nestor's credential as survivor from a grander past is literally timeless in the Ovidian adaptation of a Homeric "para-character,"²⁷ while Achilles' ghost draws on the reputation of the hypotext. Thus Nestor remains essentially unchanged as a character while Achilles' character is a ghost of his former self: fighting against an invincible opponent, being killed by

24 Menoetes' death is cynically deemed insignificant 115–121.

Note also the backlash effect after the delay: *saevumque perosus Achillem/exercet memores, plus quam civiliter, iras* ("Hating the cruel Achilles, he rekindles remembered, more than civil, anger", *Met.* 12.582–583). Hardie (1997) 147 and n. 36 points out that anger, by its nature, overshoots the limits.

25 Note also *Met.* 12.615–617 *iam cinis est... / ... / at vivit totum quae gloria compleat orbem* ("He is ash, and yet his glory lives to fill the globe"). Barchiesi (1999) 334–335 has suggested that *orbem* may refer to the cycle tradition. The anti-closure at the end of Book 12 shows the essential continuity of the cycle across book divisions (the death of Achilles as told in the *Aethiopsis*, the judgment of arms as told in the *Ilias parva* (opens Book 13)). Bömer (1986) ad *Met.* 15.877 notes that *vivam* ("I shall live") is a closural word in several cases. Note that all final episodes in Books 11 to 15 are concerned with undoing the finality of death (Aesacus, Achilles, Glaucus, Romulus, Ovid).

26 Note that Nestor doubles a pre-Iliadic (in the epic cycle sequence), i.e. *Cypria* narrative, with an Iliadic one.

27 Nestor is a "para-character" inasmuch as he figures as a narrator (as well as protagonist) of stories which lie outside the action of the *Iliad*.

Paris, and speaking from the grave only to kill a woman. Ovid's use of Nestor as a character of ur-epic thus makes possible a reference to a timeless ur-*fabula* from which Homer and Ovid can both partake, whereas the Homeric *Iliad* is defined as a fixed *sujet* that resists reworking.²⁸

The Road Less Travelled

Achilles' ghost first appeared in the first continuation, the *Odyssey*. A central topos for epic continuation is the descent to the underworld. Hardie points to the cathartic role of this journey for both the epic hero and, on a metapoetic level, the poet confronting his predecessor.²⁹ In the *Odyssey* and the *Aeneid*, this central scene marks the middle of the poem and a moment of crisis. The descent allows the appearance of characters that are clearly exported from the hypotext and are marked as alien 'ghosts' in the new texts. At the same time their 'cameos' signal the distance from the hypotext and allow the poet to engage in a metapoetic discourse on the shifted paradigm in the new text. In the *Odyssey*, this involves a radical shift of perspective as Achilles in the underworld rejects the moral code of the *Iliad* and wishes to return to life. This subjective perspective mirrors the concerns of the *Odyssey* as the first epic of continuation, an epic of survival as opposed to glorious death.

The descent to the underworld in the *Aeneid* stands symbolically for the initiation in the dark forces and Iliadic battles of the second half. Aeneas' desire to enter this realm is interpreted as a death-wish by the Sibyl (*Aen.* 6.133–135). The emphasis of the narrative is on the downward path to the underworld, even though the Sibyl stresses that the upward path is the greater struggle (*hoc opus, hic labor est*, "this is the work, this is the effort", *Aen.* 6.129). This inconsistency is in keeping with the refusal of the Odyssean code in this reversal. Not survival, but glorious death is once more the message intended for Aeneas. The underworld functions as a space of tempting temporal irreality, in which the present is eclipsed by the past and the future.

In Ovid's radical summary, their symbolic encounter is reduced to a few lines. In particular, the encounter with Anchises is downplayed. The Sibyl promises that Aeneas will see his father (*Met.* 14.113) and only few lines later the narrator tells it as fact (116–117). The transferred epithet in both cases, although

28 Zumwalt (1977) 212 similarly sees Book 12 as on the border between legend and history.

29 Hardie (2004) 143–144. See also Most (1992) 1014–1026; Hardie (1993) 59–65; Barchiesi (2001) 132–133.

common enough in epic diction, a “dear image of his father” (*simulacraque cara parentis*, 112), an “aged shade” (*umbram senilem*, 116) is a reminder that Anchises is not real and suggests a Lucretian caution towards past illusions (*Lucr.* 4.37–41).³⁰ Lucretius also expressed scepticism at the poets’ projection of underground horrors (*Lucr.* 1.102–135). Ovid acknowledges (and resists) the temptation to outdo Virgil in this topos of poetic virtuosity. The Sibyl describes it as *regna novissima mundi* (“the strangest realms of earth”, 110) and Aeneas is said to have learnt about new wars (*novis bellis*, 119) but the telling omission of Virgil’s imaginary landscape marks the infernal topography as well-known. Ovid deconstructs Virgil’s heavy teleology of the underworld scene by his ironic use of the word *novus*.³¹ The underworld scene is manifestly not new but an established cliché of continuation, but instead of engaging with Virgil in a Virgilian manner, namely through overlay (Odysseus/Aeneas), Ovid points to the hypotext’s logical weakness, its anachronistic prophecy combined with an unreal attachment to the ghosts of tradition.

Ovid instead takes literally the Sibyl’s words in the *Aeneid* and focuses on the way up from the underworld. It is possible to see in this journey nothing more than convenient paranarrative, filling in the missing bits. Ovid in fact employs several narrative strategies that are typical for continuation. He abbreviates the hypotext in function of rebalancing the new text by the addition of the Sibyl’s story; he radically shifts perspective onto a secondary and female figure; and he foregrounds the Sibyl’s personal voice as an absent presence in the hypotext.³² Ovid questions the *Aeneid*’s supra-personal fate of Aeneas by introducing the subjective experience of the Sibyl who exists only for the sake of being an oracle. The Sibyl metapoetically points to her “voice” as the only surviving part of her in the future (*Met.* 14.153); in fact, Ovid renders that voice for the first time.

30 Hill (2000) and Myers (2009) ad *Met.* 14.117 explain this by *enallage*, but note the slight difference from the Virgilian intertext, quoted by Myers, *ire ad conspectum cari genitoris* (“to go to see my dear father”, *Aen.* 6.108).

31 Myers (2009) ad *Met.* 14.112–114 suggests “last” in order of distribution, or “farthest” (s.v. *novissimus* OLD 2 and 6). However, the definitions “not previously known or experienced, unfamiliar, strange to one”, and “replacing one that formerly existed, new” (OLD s.v. *novus* 2 and 8) are more in keeping with the metapoetic reading proposed here. The underworld is new to the fictional character of Aeneas at least, if a well-established *topos* for any reader of ancient epic. In addition, Ovid’s version replaces the Virgilian one, which in turn had replaced Homer’s. It is also possible that “belonging to recent times, modern” (OLD s.v. *novus* 14) applies, given the Virgilian context. Ovid’s archaeopoetics would then comment on the *Aeneid*’s instant patina of antiquity.

32 Genette (1997), 238 (condensation), 293 (transfocalization), 391 (voice).

The Sibyl's voice also points to a hint in the hypotext, her oral pronouncement. In the *Aeneid*, Virgil asks the Sibyl to speak rather than write down her answer, alluding to the importance of the Sibylline books (*foliis tantum ne carmina manda/ne turbata volent rapidis ludibria ventis; / ipsa canas oro*, "Do not entrust your chants to leaves; they may be picked up as toys by the swift winds and fly about; please sing them yourself", *Aen.* 6.74–76). Thus he opens up the possibility of the Sibyl as a character who can converse with the hero. In Ovid, this nexus of oral and written word makes it possible to catch the Sibyl off-script, to find a chink in the Virgilian hypotext where their words might not have been recorded.

Yet there is more at stake than an ingenious inflation of scarce material. Ovid's Aeneas asks in essence a metaphysical question, just as Homer's Odysseus and Virgil's Aeneas. Achilles and Anchises both comment on the human condition of mortality *sub specie aeternitatis* from the privileged perspective of underworld dwellers. Their existence after death is imagined from a mortal standpoint, even if it is ventriloquized through a ghost. The moral lesson applies to the living, in either seeking glory or rejecting it in favor of a long life. Ovid's introduction of the Sibyl's personal story points to the dilemma that is central to the *Metamorphoses* as a whole, but also uniquely suited to the character of Aeneas (and, by extension, Augustus). What does it feel like to essentially live forever? Aeneas will, after all, be in the same position soon. When Venus asks for immortality for Aeneas, her argument is contrary to the established topos of *stat cuique sua dies*, she argues that it is enough to have crossed once into the underworld (*Met.* 14.590–591), an argument that clearly contradicts the Sibyl's words in the *Aeneid* (*bis Stygios innare lacus, bis nigra videre / Tartara*, "twice to cross the Stygian waters, twice to see black Tartarus", *Aen.* 6.134–135). Instead of reflecting the human condition through the exemplary hero, here Aeneas' unique privilege of immortality is stressed.

The Sibyl's story loops back to Apollo and Daphne in the first book of the *Metamorphoses* (*primus amor Phoebi*, "Phoebus' first love", *Met.* 1.452). The Sibyl's negotiation with Apollo goes from eternal life, to long life and long youth (*Met.* 14.132; 138; 139). It is her own metaphorical speech that marks her fate, for a pile of sand is proverbially limitless but logically limited.³³ Her

33 The Sibyl has unwittingly pointed to the symbol of death, a (burial) mound. *ego pulveris hausti / ostendens cumulum*. ("pointing to a mound of gathered dust", *Met.* 14.136). Cf. Horace *Carm.* 4.7.16.

Given the Sibyl's propensity for riddles, Ovid may allude to the Sorites paradox.

Catull. 7.1–6 provides an intriguing intertext: *Quaeris, quot mihi basiationes / tuae,*

fate recalls Lucretius' *prosopopoeia* of Nature who criticizes mortals' irrational fear of death (*eadem tamen omnia restant / omnia si perges vivendo vincere saecula*, "all things would remain the same, even if you proceed to subdue all the ages by living", *Lucr.* 3.946–949). Ovid's Sibyl draws out the experience not of living but of dying. She envisions the future as an infinite wasting away (*Met.* 14.147–149). The Sibyl predicts (the opposite of Apollo's promise of immortalization of Daphne) a time when her story will be considered ludicrous because of her changed appearance (*nec amata videbor*, "I will seem not to have been loved", 149). Ovid's insertion of the Sibyl's story here preserves her for future generations, and thus gives her a paradoxical momentary poetic immortality. The Sibyl implies that there will be future heroes who encounter her. She will serve as a reminder of the horror of a long life to those destined to need it most. Rather than illustrating the human condition through the hero, Ovid discusses the heroic condition, displaying the poetic imagination of an unknown existence instead of replicating the mortal projection of the known. In this he comes much closer to the critical outlook of Lucretius who dismissed the underworld as a projection of fears and insists that the desire for a prolonged existence is foolish (*Lucr.* 3.978–1094).³⁴

On a metapoetic note, the passage connects to the necessity of invention for each generation and the difficulty of accumulating the overwhelming tradition of years. The Sibyl's dictum *in via virtuti nulla est via* ("For virtue, no path is impassable", *Met.* 14.113) foregrounds the travel metaphor in this section. It is significant that the next episode contains the double refraction of the Polyphem story in the figures of Macareus and Achaemenides, and the poets Theocritus, Virgil and Ovid. Ovid is writing within the constraints of powerful

Lesbia, sint satis superque. / quam magnus numerus Libyssae harenae / lasarpiciferis iacet Cyrenis / oraculum Iouis inter aestuosi / et Batti ueteris sacrum sepulcrum ...

("You ask how many of your kissings, Lesbia, are enough and more than enough. As great as the number of Libyan sand from pitchbearing Cyrene that lies between the oracle of Jove and the sacred tomb of old Battus ...")

A Catullan intertext is also possible for lines 145–146 "*superest, numeros ut pulveris aequem, / tercentum messes, tercentum musta videre*." ("I still must see three hundred harvest, three hundred vintages, to equal the numbers of the dust.") Cf. *Catull.* 5.7–8 *da mi basia mille, deinde centum, dein mille altera, dein secunda centum* ... ("give me a thousand kisses, then a hundred, then another thousand, then another hundred ...") and note the *memento mori* which likens the kisses to the human life-span.

34 The allusion might be reinforced by the Callimachean beginning of Book 4 (*Lucr.* 4.1–2), after Lucretius has dealt with the superstitions of the old poets.

hypotexts and metapoetically both retraces and reinvents new ways across old territory. The Sibyl's words of *hoc opus, hic labor est* ("this is the work, this is the effort", *Aen.* 6.129) apply equally to Ovid's own endeavor to come up from the underworld, Hardie's "ghost books" of tradition, and emerge on a new path.³⁵

The Callimachean intertext appears not only in the idea of *labor* but also in the path itself (*Aet.* 1.1.25–28). The upward path is only accessible for the few initiated, while the downward path instead is trodden by all. In focusing on this untrodden path Ovid asserts originality at the moment of greatest intertextual density. Ovid stresses the novelty of making a path through the wilderness (*dumque iter horrendum per opaca crepuscula carpit*, 122). The path is rough and uncanny (*horrendum*), a word associated with awe-inspiring antiquity in Virgil³⁶ (and thus asserting priority in Ovid); it is also dense with obscure, learned allusion (*per opaca crepuscula*, "through the dark shadows").³⁷

While the path is new, Aeneas' talking to his companion while walking is not. Papaioannou points to his conversation with Achates in Virgil.³⁸ Another promising intertext is provided by *Aeneid* 8, where Virgil has Aeneas take the scenic route through the future Rome, ostensibly to make the path easier for Evander (*ibat rex obsitus aevo / et comitem Aenean iuxta natumque tenebat / ingrediens varioque viam sermone levabat*, "the king, weak with age, was walking / and keeping Aeneas and his son next to him / and eased the way with diverse talk as he went." *Aen.* 8.311). As in the underworld, Evander's discourse resonates with the future glory of Rome. Ovid's echo of this scene (*mollit sermone laborem*, "softens the effort by talk", *Met.* 14.121), instead rejects predeterminism to acknowledge the pure delight in stories, a constant theme in the *Metamorphoses* but especially poignant when the interlocutor is the Sibyl, whose pronouncements are codified, rare, and deliberately brief. This expansion of speech almost comically shows the abundance of invention, as if the Sibyl had waited seven hundred years finally to speak freely, or at least about something

35 Ovid had already quoted this line by Virgil in the "shockingly discordant context" of *Ars am.* 1.453 (Tarrant (2002) 24), where the *praeceptor* stresses the need for gifts in order to seduce women. This "window allusion" to Ovid's prior use of Virgil is a witty comment on Apollo's success with the Sibyl.

36 See *Enciclopedia Vergiliana* s.v. *horrendus*.

37 In Virgil, the focus is on the Sibyl's own obscurity (*Aen.* 6.99–100): *horrendas canit ambages antroque remugit / obscuris vera involvens*. ("She sings uncanny riddles and moans from her cave, wrapping truths in obscurity.")

38 Papaioannou (2005) 47.

other than affairs of state.³⁹ Thus Ovid combines new invention with a deliberate tethering to intertextual tradition. It is the indebtedness to the hypotext that contributes to the sensation of novelty, using the technique of Virgilian overlay. Virgil's *katabasis* re-imagines Homeric territory with the new characters Aeneas and the Sibyl. Ovid's twist lies in using these same characters on a path that is both "untrodden" in the Callimachean sense, and also recalls Aeneas' ascent of proto-Rome.

Ovid's lateral expansion at this point of the *Aeneid* owes much to his technique in the *Heroides* as he hypothesizes a highly subjective supplement at a crucial juncture. It also shows that the continuation of the *Aeneid* resides in lateral expansion rather than linear continuation. Ovid minimizes the linear continuation of the *Aeneid* (*Met.* 14.581–608). After a summary of the *Aeneid*, he truncates the final scene and its significance and passes straight to another death, that of Aeneas (*Met.* 14.584). What he performs is not so much a continuation but a few extra lines (thirty-five) to supplement the *Aeneid*. In doing so, Ovid undoes the ambivalent closure of Virgil's final scene by replacing it with the ambivalent finality of Aeneas' apotheosis. Ovid, as it were, "corrects" Virgil's open closure as "premature." He stops short of meaningful continuation, since the king list is interrupted at 622 by the Pomona-Vertumnus story.⁴⁰

Ovid's ironic reception of Virgil concerns not least the *Aeneid*'s role for Augustus. The prophecy of Jupiter at the end of the *Metamorphoses* collapses the temporal order in a deliberately pseudo-Virgilian manner. Not only does Jupiter veto Venus' intervention by invoking the fates, a scene reminiscent of the *Aeneid*'s beginning; his enumeration of the civil war battles reads as a preamble to the *pax Augusta* (*Met.* 15.822–831). At Caesar's death, Jupiter refers Venus to a monumental book that is indestructible (*incisa adamante perenni / fata tui generis*, "engraved in ageless adamant, the fates of your descendants", *Met.* 15.813–814), as if to preclude the very possibility of invention, paranarratives or continuation.⁴¹ Ovid thus stops at a historically Virgilian moment,

39 Cf. the tagline for Lubitsch's *Ninotchka* (1939): "Garbo laughs!"

In addition, Ovid might have had in mind Horace's ascent at the end of *Carm.* 3.30, *scandit cum tacita (sic!) virgine pontifex* ("the priest ascends the Capitoline hill with the silent virgin").

40 For Ovid's *Thebaid* (*Met.* 3.1–4.603) as reception of the *Aeneid* see Hardie (1990) and Janan (2009).

41 Gladhill (2012) 8–9 points out the allusion to *G.* 2.501–504 in the historically situated prophecy of a coming Golden Age.

In quoting Virgil, Ovid comments simultaneously on his own technique, moving an

the end of the civil war. Reference to Augustus' reign is framed by prayers for longevity (838–840; 868–870) as if it had just begun.⁴²

To be Continued ...

At the culmination of the *Metamorphoses*, all masks drop as the only two remaining protagonists face each other, Ovid and the emperor. Metamorphosis is at last incarnated in the only two human beings that can possibly be said to live after death in the non-mythical world: poets and emperors. It is a commonplace of poets that patrons need poets to immortalize them, a deliberate attempt to redress the power balance between poet and patron but nonetheless containing some truth. For Ovid, the model of such exchange is clear in the shaping of the principate by Virgil and Horace in particular, and their reciprocal introduction of a newly created but immediately classicized library of Latin authors.⁴³ Both Tarrant and Robinson suggest that Ovid feels acutely the passing of this generation, both distant and near. *Vergilium vidi tantum* ("Virgil, I only saw", *Tr.* 4.10.51), as Robinson puts it, stresses this ephemeral contact: "Virgil is for Ovid a text—he has only read him."⁴⁴ While this is undoubtedly true, *vidi* still retains some of its eye-witness quality, and may point to the passing the torch from Homer to Ennius (*Ann.* fr. 1.3 Skutsch) which signals a similar monumental shift (and potential endorsement) to the new generation.

Augustus' library functioned as a microcosm of literary survival. Ovid had witnessed the transformation of poets such as Virgil and Horace through induction in the library, Virgil-the-poet into Virgil-the-book. Ovid's own experience is markedly different: in exile, a living death, he sees both himself and his book banned, in a kind of negative preview of literary reception. What is more, the ban on the *Amores* breaks the unity of the "poetic body" of the poet's com-

immoveable text. Cf. n. 28 above. See Hinds (1998) 119–122 for the principle of "unrepeatability." See also Smith (1998) 124–130.

Considering the physical impermanence of the Twelve Tables and the destruction of the Sibylline books, one might wonder about the un-Romanness of such a textual monument.

42 The last dateable event in the narrative is Caesar's death (*Met.* 15.845). The poem thus stops short a year before Ovid's birth as if to further complicate his ambivalent presence in the poem (*ad mea tempora*, *Met.* 1.4). Barchiesi (2001) 75 remarks on this timing, with different emphasis.

43 Tarrant (2002) 14–15.

44 Robinson (2006) 208.

plete works. Virgil survives in not just the *Aeneid* but in the trifecta of *Eclogues*, *Georgics* and *Aeneid*. Thus Ovid has an acute sense of literary survival that goes beyond the cliché of poetic immortality. He is aware of his predecessors' fate, and his own lived "afterlife" in exile. His literary reputation lies in the margins of the acknowledged and established greats in the manner of the poets of the epic cycle.

Still, Ovid's last ace up his sleeve might be the revenge of the living. As Hardie has pointed out, the obsession with closure is by nature totalitarian.⁴⁵ Even the imposition of a random stopping point, by its intrinsic finality, retains signification. And yet, for the same reason the ostentatiously static paradoxically retains openness. Hardie remarks on the impossible task of stopping history, for Augustus or anybody else.⁴⁶ In borrowing closural gestures from the icons Virgil and Horace, Ovid aims to give his work an all-Augustan conclusion, suggesting his obvious place in this lineage. By association, Ovid's poem seems to gain finally a stable point. Barchiesi has shown the (perhaps excessively) strong closure of the *Metamorphoses*.⁴⁷ In seemingly jettisoning the chaotic principle of the rest of the poem, here time untangles in a straight annalistic fashion and strives towards the end, rushing through history to point to Augustus as a double of Jupiter. The ring composition through the simile introduced in Book 1 (*magni ... Palatia caeli*, "the Palatine of the great sky", *Met.* 1.176) contributes to this finale. Ovid's epic closure, triumphantly Augustan as it is, may even be compared favorably to the difficult closure of the *Aeneid*. Ovid's closure is written in the frame of Virgilian and Horatian panegyric. His anticipation of Augustus' apotheosis (*tarda sit illa dies*, "may that day be far away", 868–870) echoes such predictions in Virgil's *Georgics* (1.24–42) or Horace *Carm.* 1.2.45 (the disconcerting effect being their historical relativity).⁴⁸ Similarly, allusion to the *Aeneid* or to Horace's *Odes* points to the founding pillars of Augustan poetry. The dense intertextual allusion thus reinforces the poem's closure, uniting the poets' voices, as it were.

Ovid's echo of these immortals, however, plays with their tropes of finality. The stability introduced by using his predecessors' works, both in the pseudo-Virgilian prophecy and the allusion to Horace's *exegi monumentum* ("I have perfected a monument", *Carm.* 3.30.1), points to Augustan ossification: the illusion of static timelessness that has aged with the princes. Augustus has

45 Hardie (1993) ch. 1; Fowler (1997) 7–10; Barchiesi (1997) 207–208.

46 Hardie (1993) 2.

47 Barchiesi (1997) 195 cautions: "An excess of concluding gestures can generate the structure of an open ending." See also Wheeler (2000) 107–154.

48 Barchiesi (2001) 78.

transformed the once-alive poets and their fresh poetry into not just classical monuments but so-to-speak fossils. The official iconography gives an intriguing parallel; there is no record of Augustan portraiture that show him as an old man.⁴⁹ Augustus' likeness is seemingly immune to aging even as this attachment must become increasingly absurd for the old Augustus.

Instead of undoing the powerful closure associated with his predecessors' defining works, Ovid's intertextual intensification stresses permanence and removes contingency. The stability of Virgil's *fatum* and Horace's *monumentum* both were underwritten by the religious authority of Jupiter. Ovid re-uses the tropes but makes them absolute (Jupiter is powerless against the indestructible quality of the tablets of fate as he is against Ovid's opus, *Met.* 15.811–812; 871–872).⁵⁰ Even the concessive *siquid habent veri vatum praesagia*, ("If the prophecies of poets have any truth to them", 879) may be read that way. While Ovid no doubt refers to himself with *vatum* in a self-fulfilling prophecy (867), he also points to the tradition, if the phrase is read to include the proven *vates* Horace and Virgil. If Horace and Virgil have survived their deaths through poetic immortality, so can Ovid by association.⁵¹ As a correlative, Augustus' own immortality (as prophesied by Ovid's Jupiter), relies on that same vatic power.

In commenting on the end of the *Metamorphoses*, Hershkowitz remarks on the schizophrenia of Ovid's imagined afterlife. Leaving his body behind, Ovid's ego travels above the stars, while Ovid-as-book will be read by the people (if perhaps not by the emperor).⁵² The reference to his readers throughout the empire amplifies his fame. The multiplication of readings scatters his episodic poem in a deliberate confusion of oral and written word, poem as *fabula* (episodic story) and as poem-text (in its static written form). Ovid's *samizdat* end thus escapes the finality of banning or destruction of any actual poem.⁵³ The phrase also may allude to Dido's death and points to another potential paranarrative by a minor character, Anna as the recipient of Dido's last words (*ore legam*, "let me read it from her lips", *Aen.* 4.685), a narratological move that Ovid had employed most noticeably in the survivors Achaemenides

49 Price (1984) 172 as quoted by Barchiesi (1997) 195.

50 Fowler (1997) 10: "Jupiter's book is also the *Aeneid*, retrospectively figured as the epic of closure in contrast to Ovid's epic of change and continuity: and as God the Father he is both male reader and male author, *himself* laying down the law once and for all, the Way Things Are." (italics and capitalization in the original)

51 Rosati (1979) 119–121.

52 Hershkowitz (1998) 188–190.

53 Cf. Ovid claims to have produced several copies at *Tr.* 1.7.23–26.

and Macareus. Achaemenides in Virgil is the one that got away, rivaling the account of Odysseus despite his inferior status. Contrary to the totalizing and monopolizing tendency of epic, the insistence that there will be only one, these loose ends and narrator-bystanders cannot be controlled. The Augustan canonization, powerful as it is, still may be compromised by other readers.

In staying true to the dynamic closure of the *Metamorphoses*, the author's claim of total control over continuation should perhaps be qualified. In the passages discussed, continuation was assured through the random oral transmission of alternative stories. Nestor's or the Sibyl's memories occur as ostensibly "oral" interludes of a written, fixed hypotext.⁵⁴ Ovid's own prediction "*in ore populi legar*" ("I will be gleaned/read by the mouth of the people", *Met.* 15.877) envisions the poet's final words as being seized at the moment of pronouncement. Continuation pretends to seize ephemeral utterances and aims in turn to become a canonized hypotext. Yet continuation remains an unpredictable dialogue between the poet and his reader(s) in ranking the relative value of texts.

While the focus of this chapter has been on Ovid's continuation of his predecessors, an obvious correlative might trace it from the *Metamorphoses* and note that Ovid's inclusion of the epic cycle material assures at least its marginal survival. Contrary to the view of the cyclic poems as parasitic, these derivative traditions seem to shore up the monuments of Homer and Virgil. The powerful hypotext seems to invite proliferation by a successor who spots opportunities for completion or invention. Ovid's vision that he will be read might invoke not just the transmission of the *Metamorphoses* as text but also their role as dynamic point of departure for other poets' own cyclic storytelling continuations. Ovid's imperial aspiration (*quaque patet domitis Romana potentia terris*, "wherever Roman might extends over lands subdued", *Met.* 15.877), matches not only the political sway of the Roman empire but might be seen to mirror the spread of the Homeric poems throughout the Hellenized world, a continuous poetic empire.⁵⁵

54 Note that the Sibyl denies having a voice of iron (*ferrea vox*) in Virgil *Aen.* 6.626.

On orality and closure see Fowler (1997) 12–13.

55 Thanks to Denis Feeney for reading and commenting on this chapter, and to Marco Fantuzzi for allowing me to read the draft of Rosati's contribution.

Bibliography

- Barchiesi, A. (1997) "Endgames: Ovid Metamorphoses 15 and Fasti 6", in Fowler (1997) 181–208.
- Barchiesi, A. (1999) "Representations of suffering and interpretation in the Aeneid", in Hardie (1999) 324–344.
- Barchiesi, A. (2001) *Speaking volumes. Narrative and Intertext in Ovid and Other Latin Poets*. London.
- Bömer, F. (1986) *P. Ovidius Naso Metamorphosen Buch XIV–XV*. Heidelberg.
- Burgess, J.S. (2001) *The Tradition of the Trojan War in Homer and the Epic Cycle*. Baltimore.
- Cameron, A. (1995) *Callimachus and his critics*. Princeton.
- Clarke, M., Currie, B., and Lyne, R.O.A.M. (eds.) (2006) *Epic Interactions: perspectives on Homer, Virgil, and the epic tradition*. Oxford.
- Fantuzzi, M. and Tsagalis, C. (eds.) (2015) *The Greek Epic Cycle and its Ancient Reception: A Companion*. Cambridge.
- Fowler, D. (1997) "Second Thoughts on Closure", in Fowler (1997) 3–22.
- Genette, G. (1997) *Palimpsests*. Lincoln.
- Gladhill, B. (2012) "Gods, Caesar and Fate in Aeneid 1 and Metamorphoses 15", *Dictynna* 9, <http://dictynna.revues.org/820>, consulted August 6, 2013.
- Griffin, J. (1977) "The Epic cycle and the uniqueness of Homer", *JHS* 97, 39–53.
- Hardie, P. (1990) "Ovid's Theban History: The first anti-Aeneid?", *CQ* 40, 224–235.
- Hardie, P. (1993) *The epic successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*. Cambridge.
- Hardie, P. (1997) "Closure in Latin Epic", in Fowler (1997) 139–162.
- Hardie, P. (ed.) (1999) *Virgil: Critical assessments and authors. Volume III*. London and New York.
- Hardie, P. (2002) *Ovid's Poetics of Illusion*. Cambridge.
- Hardie, P. (ed.) (2002) *The Cambridge Companion to Ovid*. Cambridge.
- Hardie, P. (2004) "In the steps of the Sibyl: tradition and desire in the epic Underworld", *MD* 52, 143–156.
- Hardie, P. (2012) *Rumour and Renown: Representations of 'Fama' in Western Literature*. Cambridge.
- Hershkowitz, D. (1998) *The Madness of Epic. Reading insanity from Homer to Statius*. Oxford.
- Hill, D. (2000) *Ovid: Metamorphoses XIII–XV*. Warminster.
- Hinds, S. (1998) *Allusion and intertext. Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Janan, M. (2009) *Reflections in a Serpent's Eye*. Oxford.
- Martindale, C. (ed.) (1997) *Cambridge Companion to Virgil*. Cambridge.

- Miller, P.A. (2004) "The Parodic Sublime: Ovid's Reception of Vergil in *Heroides* 7", *MD* 52, 57–72.
- Most, G. (1992) "Il poeta nell'Ade: catabasi epica e teoria dell'epos tra Omero e Virgilio", *SIFC* 10, 1014–1026.
- Myers, S. (1994) *Ovid's Causes. Cosmogony and Aetiology in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Ann Arbor.
- Myers, S. (2009) *Ovid Metamorphoses Book XIV*. Cambridge.
- Papaioannou, S. (2005) *Epic Succession and Dissension: Ovid, Metamorphoses* 13.623–14.582, and the Reinvention of the Aeneid. Berlin.
- Papaioannou, S. (2007) *Redesigning Achilles: 'Recycling' the Epic Cycle in the 'Little Iliad' (Ovid, Metamorphoses* 12.1–13.622). Berlin.
- Price, S. (1984) *Rituals and Power*. Cambridge.
- Roberts, D.H., Dunn, F.M., and Fowler, D. (eds.) (1997) *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*. Princeton.
- Robinson, M. (2006) "Augustan Responses to the Aeneid", in M. Clarke, B. Currie and R.O.A.M. Lyne (2006) 185–216.
- Rosati, G. (1979) "L'esistenza letteraria: Ovidio e l'autocoscienza della poesia", *MD* 2: 101–136.
- Rosati, G. (2015) "Ovid and the Epic Cycle", in M. Fantuzzi and C. Tsagalis (2015) 565–577.
- Smith, R.A. (1998) *Poetic Allusion and Poetic Embrace in Ovid and Virgil*. Ann Arbor.
- Tarrant, R. (1997) "Aspects Of Virgil's reception in antiquity", in Martindale (1997) 56–72.
- Tarrant, R. (2002) "Ovid and ancient literary history", in Hardie (2002) 13–33.
- Von Glinski, M.L. (2012) *Simile and Identity in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Cambridge.
- Wheeler, S. (2000) *Narrative Dynamics in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Tübingen.
- Zumwalt, N. (1977) "*Fama Subversa*: Theme and Structure in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 12", *CSCA* 10, 209–222.

Continuing the *Aeneid* in the First Century: Ovid's "Little *Aeneid*", Lucan's *Bellum Civile*, and Silius Italicus' *Punica*

Neil W. Bernstein

The fiction of embodying earlier literary tradition inaugurates the genre of Roman hexameter epic. The prooemium of Ennius' *Annales* invokes the Muses "who beat great Olympus with your feet (*pedibus*)", indicating thereby that the work will be in the dactylic hexameter of Homer's epics rather than in the Saturnian metre used by his Latin predecessors.¹ In the same opening passage of the first Roman hexameter epic, the ghost of "Homer the poet seemed to be present" (*uisus Homerus adesse poeta*) to the narrator, in order to announce that his soul has passed into Ennius' body.² Physically embodying the tradition enables the poet to continue it in a new region, new language, and new era. Ennius' dialogue with Homer's ghost offered an attractive image to later Roman epic poets. We owe much of our knowledge of the opening scene of the *Annales* to Lucretius (*DRN* 1.120–126), who tells the story of Homer's epiphany in order to debunk the notion of an Underworld populated by ghosts. Virgil evokes the language of Ennius' encounter when Hector's ghost appears to Aeneas to tell him not to fight and die in Troy but to resettle the Trojan gods in a new land.³ Silius Italicus' historical epic *Punica* adapts the scene for poetological purposes apparently closer to those of Ennius. Upon encountering the ghost of Homer in the Underworld, the hero Scipio remarks: "If the Fates would now permit this poet to sing of Roman deeds throughout the world, how much greater those same deeds would appear to our future descendants through this man's witness!"⁴ Silius accordingly creates an space for himself to be a new Homer, this time as the poet of Scipio's deeds.

1 *Musae, quae pedibus magnum pulsatis Olympum*, Enn. *Ann.* 1 Skutsch. It is unclear whether this is the first line of the epic; see Skutsch 1985 ad loc. See Fisher 2012 on the contrast with prior Latin literary tradition.

2 Enn. *Ann.* 3 Skutsch; see Skutsch 1985: 147.

3 "Look! In sleep, most unfortunate Hector seemed to appear before my eyes." *in somnis, ecce, ante oculos maestissimus Hector / uisus adesse mihi*, Verg. *Aen.* 2.270–271.

4 *si nunc fata darent, ut Romula facta per orbem / hic caneret uates, quanto maiora futuros / facta eadem intrarent hoc, inquit, teste nepotes!* Sil. *Pun.* 13.793–795.

A later poem's engagement with an earlier poem generates new perspectives on the relationship both between the two works, and between the two works and the surrounding tradition. Such engagement inevitably creates an "immanent literary history",⁵ whether or not it is framed with the self-conscious sophistication of the four examples briefly surveyed above. Ennius' narrative of metempsychosis, the transmigration of Homer's soul into his Roman body, is only one means of representing the engagement between a new epic and those in the prior tradition stretching back to the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*. Renewing Homer's story is akin to resuscitating the bodies of Homer and his characters. The figure of the ghost personifies the process of literary continuation.

The continuation of Homer in Virgil's *Aeneid* serves as the exemplary literary model for all subsequent Roman epics. In answering the question, "so what happens after the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*?", Virgil's poem provides both the dominant narrative of Roman mythical prehistory and a repertoire of narrative strategies of continuation. Homer's characters remain recognizable but change in their significance both to the epic and to the world-historical processes that it narrates. Minor Homeric characters such as Aeneas become major, and major characters such as Diomedes refuse to continue playing their former roles as opponents of the Trojans. Meanwhile, Homeric narratives become the frame for the evaluation of characters' new exploits, a device laid bare in the Virgilian Sibyl's remark that "another Achilles has already been born in Latium" (*alius Latio iam partus Achilles*, Verg. *Aen.* 6.89). Virgil's self-conscious play with Homeric roles and story-patterns, especially the *oppositio in imitando* of setting Aeneas against Turnus, becomes formative for the subsequent tradition. Both characters reprise selected aspects of Homer's Achilles and Hector, as invader and defender, madman and family man, victor and loser. Continuation takes the form of repetition with a difference.⁶

Intertextual engagement with Virgil's *Aeneid* is one of the dominant compositional characteristics of Roman epic of the first century CE. Modes of engagement range from smaller-scale linguistic allusion to larger-scale thematic adaptation.⁷ Poets adapt the *Aeneid* by composing new narrative episodes involving Virgilian characters and situations, in much the same way that Virgil had composed a new epic from Homeric material. This chapter examines how three first-century epic poems, Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, Lucan's *Bellum Civile*, and Silius Italicus' *Punica*, present themselves as continuations of Virgil's *Aeneid*. Con-

5 See Hinds 2001.

6 See Quint 1993.

7 See Hardie 1993, Hinds 1998.

tinuation need not always consist of the creation of narrative events that occur subsequent in narrative time to the events of the prior work. Through use of a trope that Alessandro Barchiesi attractively termed the “future reflexive”,⁸ the earlier work may now be made to appear to have inevitably predicted its successor. Continuation accordingly may reify what the preceding tradition had left only as a narrative potential.

Ovid’s condensation of the war in Italy in the *Aeneid* will serve as a convenient example of such reification:

*spes erat, in nymphas animata classe marinas
posse metu monstri Rutulum desistere bello:
perstat, habetque deos pars utraque, quodque deorum est
instar, habent animos; nec iam dotalia regna,
nec sceptrum soceri, nec te, Lavinia virgo,
sed vicisse petunt deponendique pudore
bella gerunt, tandemque Venus victricia nati
arma videt, Turnusque cadit ...*

OID, *Metamorphoses* 14:569–573

With the fleet animated as sea nymphs, the hope was that the Rutulian might desist from war in fear of the sight: he persists, and each side has its gods, and what is like the gods, they have courage; nor any more do they seek the kingdom as a dowry, nor the father-in-law’s sceptre, nor you, virgin Lavinia, but to conquer, and they wage war from shame of laying arms aside, and at last Venus sees her son’s arms victorious, and Turnus falls ...

The breathless polysyndeton suggests the image of a reader impatiently unrolling the scrolls as fast as he can in order to get to the end of Virgil’s poem. The passage skips around the final four books of the *Aeneid*: Turnus hurls fire on Aeneas’ ships in Book 9 and is killed in the final lines of Book 12. The brief passage frames the killing’s motive, audience, and manner in conspicuously different terms than Virgil. Fighting “from shame of laying [arms] aside” (*deponendi pudore*) might apply to the Turnus who cannot accept Latinus’ invitation to stand down (*Aen.* 12.72–80), but certainly not to Aeneas. The gods Jupiter, Juno, and Juturna are the witnesses of the combat mentioned in Virgil’s text, not Venus. To omit Turnus’ supplication and Aeneas’ change of mind (*Aen.*

8 See Barchiesi 1993.

12.930–952) results in a very different perspective on the justifiability of Aeneas' final action. The concluding passage of the *Aeneid* has posed serious interpretive problems for readers virtually from the moment of its composition. One characteristic solution to the problem has in fact been continuation, most famously seen in the Renaissance poet Maffeo Vegio's *Supplementum*.⁹ Ovid blithely summarizes the killing of Turnus in a line and a half, as part of a much longer narrative conventionally called the "Little *Aeneid*" (*Met.* 13.623–14.582), a series of semi-connected episodes that follow Aeneas from Troy to Italy. The "Little *Aeneid*" may use Virgil's text as its narrative foundation, but Ovid demonstrates artistic independence at each point through self-conscious changes in narrative emphasis, logic, and ethics. Narrative continuation might seem on its surface to be the sincerest form of flattery, but in Ovid's hands it becomes a vehicle of parody, distortion, and criticism of Virgilian ideals.¹⁰

Though its vision of human suffering may be pessimistic, Virgil's *Aeneid* also includes a number of optimistic prophecies regarding the Golden Age.¹¹ The opening speech of Jupiter (*Aen.* 1.286–296) predicts the beneficent reign of a "Trojan Caesar born from glorious ancestry" (*nascetur pulchra Troianus origine Caesar*, *Aen.* 1.286), whose coming will shut the gates of war and imprison the personification of madness that provokes civil conflict inside. Lucan's incomplete *Bellum Civile*, written in the middle of the first century CE, reverses this optimistic picture.¹² Here evocations of Caesar's Trojan associations and the divine ancestry of his house become the pretexts for domination of a formerly free people. I focus on the visit of Julius Caesar to the site of Troy after his victory over the senatorial forces at Pharsalus, where Lucan takes on Virgil's myth of Trojan origins most directly. At the end of the first century CE, the consular Silius Italicus composed the *Punica*, an epic in seventeen books on the second Punic War between Rome and Carthage (218–202 BCE). Along with Lucan's *Bellum Civile*, it is one of the few extant examples of historical epic from the early imperial period. Where Lucan had eschewed both gods and ghosts as motivators of historical events, Silius presents the story of the war between Rome and Carthage as the continuation of the anger of Virgil's Juno and Dido. In keeping with a recent revival of interest in the *Punica*, this chapter argues that Silius' adaptation of Virgilian narrative is independent, critical, successful, and fundamentally pessimistic. Just as the other poets of the first century CE reproduce

9 See Tarrant 2012: 16–36.

10 Papaïoannou 2005 comprehensively reviews the narrative strategies that contribute to the Ovidian "reinvention" of the *Aeneid*.

11 See O'Hara 1990.

12 See Narducci 2002.

elements of the *Aeneid*'s narrative in order to question its ideals, Silius adapts his predecessor's text in order to criticize Virgil's justification of the Roman past and future. Framing the *Punica* as a continuation of the *Aeneid* enables the re-mythologization of Roman historical epic. Silius thereby marks a shift in aesthetics from the other epic poets of the Flavian era, who wrote on mythological topics.¹³

Ovid's "Little Aeneid" and the Problem of Origins

One means of continuing an epic is to create the illusion of a partition (however permeable) between the narratives of a prior work and those in the new work of continuation. Thus, for example, Virgil's *Aeneid* features repeated emphatic statements by multiple Homeric characters that the Trojan War is over. Hector's ghost appears to Aeneas during the sack of Troy to insist that fighting on is useless, while Hector's widow Andromache explains how she came to be remarried to a Trojan rather than living out the remainder of her life as a Greek hero's concubine (*Aen.* 3.321–343). Virgil's Trojans rescue Odysseus' shipmate Achaemenides from the Cyclops' island, in forgiveness of his former role as one of the sackers of their city (*Aen.* 3.655–691). Diomedes refuses the Latins' request to aid them in battle because he sees no need to fight Aeneas once more (*Aen.* 11.252–293). The poet's choices of speaker lends the appearance of authority to this attempt to create closure. Claims that there is no longer a purpose to fighting at Troy (Hector), or a need to fight Aeneas again (Diomedes), are more persuasive if they come respectively from Troy's greatest defender and Aeneas' former foe. Homeric characters persuade one another that their stories have ended in the *Aeneid* and thus the new story of Trojan settlement in Italy can begin.¹⁴ Juno's acquiescence to Jupiter (*Aen.* 12.808–828) presents the most authoritative version of these narratives of an end to opposition to the former Trojans, now to be called Romans. The *Aeneid* thereby signals its creation of new space for the relation of its narrative. The Trojan War must end not just so Juno can be appeased but so the poet will have a new story to tell.

¹³ See Marks 2010.

¹⁴ The opposition between Greek and Trojan is transposed instead to the war in Italy, and blurred as both sides try to affiliate themselves with Greece. Thus Turnus displays Inachid ancestors on his shield (*Aen.* 7.789–791), and Aeneas supplicates Evander with an appeal to their common descent from Atlas (*Aen.* 8.127–151). See Syed 2005, Hannah 2004, and Toll 1997.

Ovid's "Little *Aeneid*" employs Virgilian figures for quite different purposes in a non-linear narrative that makes a mockery of the concept of "epic continuation." The narrative of the final books of the *Metamorphoses* gradually guides the reader from Troy to Rome and from the mythological past toward the historical present. Yet digressive tales constantly disrupt any perception of such progress on the level of the individual episode by creating unexpected directions for the narrative. Garth Tissol observes that the personified figure of *Fama* (*Met.* 12.39–63), "both a symbol and an embodiment of flux within the narrative", inaugurates the Trojan and Roman books of the epic.¹⁵ Rather than steady movement toward the fulfilment of a pre-announced epic *telos*, the narrative's guiding aesthetics are "indirection and unpredictability."¹⁶ Stephen Hinds accordingly speaks of Ovid's project as one of literary "annexation", Sophia Papaïoannou of the "reinvention" of the *Aeneid*.¹⁷ Both of these terms appeal to different means of engagement with Virgil rather than the notion of linearity implied in "continuation."¹⁸ Such identifications of contrast between the epic's narrative goals should not be taken to imply that Virgilian reinvention of Homer is somehow simpler, more credulous, or less intelligent than Ovidian playfulness. In light of the cynical pre-Virgilian tradition of Aeneas' flight from Troy, Aeneas' appeal to Hector's ghost can always be read as a coward's self-exculpation, and Virgil's Achaemenides "merits" his rescue in part because he offers the Trojans practical help.¹⁹ Philip Hardie's analysis of the Speech of Pythagoras offers an alternate model of Ovidian "continuation" of the *Aeneid*.²⁰ The speech puts the consequences of Aeneas' foundation in a thoroughly different philosophical frame than the ones found in the *Aeneid*. Like Ennius' Dream of Homer, the Speech of Pythagoras fulfils the same role of preface to Roman history. Pythagoras serves as figure of both emperor and poet, destined to escape mortality, in contrast to the narrator of the *Aeneid* who has no identifying characteristics or personal narrative. As the *telos* of the present chapter is

15 See Tissol 2002: 309.

16 See Tissol 2002: 306–307.

17 Hinds 1998: 104, Papaïoannou 2005. For Ovid's discussion of himself as a literary successor, see Ingleheart 2010.

18 See Myers 2009: 11–18.

19 Aeneas' self-justification: Casali 1995. Achaemenides' "merited" rescue: Verg. *Aen.* 3.666–667 *nos procul inde fugam trepidi celerare recepto / supplice sic merito tacitique incidere funem*. See Horsfall 2006 ad loc. For Ovid as an early critic of Virgilian justifications for the violence of Aeneas' foundation, see Hardie 1990.

20 See Hardie 2009: 136–152, Hardie 1997.

a study of continuation in the two historical epics that follow on Ovid, I focus instead on one of the *Metamorphoses*' "historical" strategies of reinvention.

The "Little *Aeneid*" reimagines Virgil's brief references to metamorphosis as pretexts for "historical" supplementation. In telling Italian tales of metamorphosis, Ovid uncovers some of the problems in Virgil's elliptical and self-contradictory account of primitive Latium. Readers have long recognized a problem in Virgil's description of Latium before the coming of Aeneas: it is at once a peaceful paradise irrevocably corrupted by the Trojans' arrival, and a place where violent conflict was and always had been the norm.²¹ Metamorphosis is at work even in this more rationalized world: as Ovid noted in his summary of the *Aeneid* (quoted above), the Magna Mater transforms Aeneas' ships into sea nymphs (Verg. *Aen.* 10.215–259). Virgil's description of Latinus' throne room includes a three-line account of Circe's metamorphosis of Picus, an early king of Latium (*Aen.* 7.189–191). Ovid's Macareus, one of Odysseus' shipmates, relates a far lengthier tale of Circe's failed courtship of the king and metamorphic revenge (*Met.* 14.320–434). This episode can be analogized to other love triangles set in primitive Italy, such as Circe's equally unsuccessful pursuit of Glaucus, who went to her for help in courting Scylla (*Met.* 14.1–74), or the parody of Virgilian pastoral in Polyphemus' hilariously unsuccessful courtship of Galatea, lover of Acis (*Met.* 13.750–897).²² The reader is accordingly offered a prehistory of Latium where failed romance leading to violent conflict is the norm rather than the exception provoked by the arrival of migrants, and where magical figures such as Circe intervene in the royal succession long before Juno sends the Fury Allecto to stir up war on the peninsula.

After the "Little *Aeneid*" has concluded, Ovid's epic narrates the apotheoses of various proto-Roman and Roman rulers. The *Metamorphoses* relates the elevation to divinity of Aeneas (14.581–608), Romulus (14.805–828), Romulus' wife Hersilia (14.829–851), and concludes with the "historical" transformation of Julius Caesar into the *sidus Iulium*, the comet that appeared in the skies shortly after Caesar's assassination in 44 BCE (15.843–870). The repetition of the apotheosis scenes provides a structural element in a localized part of an otherwise unruly narrative. Through a characteristically Ovidian inversion of the convention that speaking is prior to writing, the scene of Romulus' apotheosis makes it appear as if the gods have "heard" Jupiter speak what Ovid's readers know is the "written" Roman epic tradition of Ennius' *Annales*.²³ The narratives of the divinization of Rome's early rulers also make one of the poem's

21 See Horsfall 2000, Moorton 1989.

22 See Papaioannou 2005: 113–142.

23 Ovid's Mars turns out to be a careful reader of Ennius: "For I remember and I have noted

more direct interventions in its contemporary world, by forming an association in the reader's mind with the central element in Augustan propaganda, the ruler's claim to authority based on his descent from *Divus Julius*.²⁴ The afterlife of Aeneas as Indigetes accordingly fits into a narrative of serial apotheosis that properly begins with Hercules' death in *Metamorphoses* 9 and concludes with the prediction of immortality that the narrator triumphantly makes for himself in the epic's coda (15.871–879).

Ovid's reframing of the events of the *Aeneid* make the Virgilian Jupiter's prophecy appear to be lacunose and in need of Ovidian supplementation to be comprehensible. The propagation of scenes of apotheosis also appears to reduce its validity as a warrant of power. If a figure as irrelevant to Roman destiny as the narrator of the *Metamorphoses* can enjoy its benefit, then should it serve as the justification of Augustan rule? Ovid's use of narrative reframing, continuation, and supplementation to question the claims of Virgil's work becomes a model followed in the Roman historical epics written later in the first century CE, Lucan's *Bellum Civile* and Silius Italicus' *Punica*.

Lucan's *Bellum Civile*: Julius Caesar in the Ruins of Troy

Lucan's ten-book *Bellum Civile*, an epic account of the first eighteen months of the war between Julius Caesar and Pompey (49–48 BCE), eschews one of the central narrative elements of mythological epic. Instead of relating how the gods motivate the narrative, as in the epics of Homer and Virgil, the narrator laments the gods' lack of intervention in human affairs. The Olympian gods are negative presences, and continuation of Virgil's *Aeneid* in this narrative accordingly occurs through a radical shift in teleology. The prophecies of Virgil's Jupiter (*Aen.* 1.257–296) and Anchises (*Aen.* 6.756–853) construct an optimistic picture of eternal rule by Augustus and his successors, albeit with internal inconsistencies that readers as early as Ovid noticed.²⁵ For Lucan's narrator, the Virgilian Golden Age was a hoax. Pompey's defeat at Pharsalus, the epic's turning point, elicits an angry outburst from the narrator regarding the Olympian gods' absence and their replacement by human-created gods:

your dutiful words in my mindful spirit, 'there will be one whom you will raise into the blue regions of the sky'" (*nam memoro memorique animo pia uerba notaui, 'unus erit, quem tu tolles in caerulea caeli,'* Ov. *Met.* 14.813–814). See Myers 2009 ad loc. for discussion of the adaptation of Ennius' line (*Ann.* 54 Skutsch).

24 See Tissol 2002.

25 See O'Hara 1990.

*mortalia nulli
sunt curata deo. cladis tamen huius habemus
uindictam, quantam terris dare numina fas est:
bella pares superis facient ciuilia diuos,
fulminibus manes radiisque ornabit et astris
inque deum templis iurabit Roma per umbras.*

LUCAN, *BC* 7.454–459

Yet we have revenge
for this disaster, as much as gods may give to mortals:
the civil wars will create divinities equal to those above;
with thunderbolts and rays and stars Rome will adorn
the dead and in the temples of the gods will swear by ghosts.²⁶

Virgil died near the beginning of Augustus' long reign and so did not live to see a perpetuation of the Julian dynasty to the emperor's successors. When Lucan wrote, the dynasty founded by Caesar's successor Augustus appeared stable and likely to rule indefinitely, although war would in fact bring it to an end just a few years after Lucan's death. In 65 CE, the year in which Lucan was condemned to death by the emperor Nero, the Julio-Claudian emperors had been reigning for nearly a century since Octavian's assumption of the title *Augustus* in 27 BCE. Lucan places the advent of Rome's domination by the house of Caesar twenty years before that moment, at the battle of Pharsalus in 48 BCE, in which Caesar's forces decisively defeated Pompey. In that defeat, Lucan's narrator laments, Roman liberty died as well.

The initial focus of Lucan's epic is on the devastation caused by the civil war, still visible over a century later in the Italy of his day (*BC* 1.24–32). The proem to the *Bellum Civile* suggests that the reign of Nero was adequate compensation for the violence of the past. In the words of the narrator, the civil war's "crimes and unspeakable deeds themselves please us thanks to this reward" (*scelera ipsa nefasque / hac mercede placent*, Luc. *BC* 1.37–38).²⁷ There is a strong case for reading these lines first as strange (how can something "unspeakable" also be pleasing?), and next as disingenuous or at the very least half-hearted in their praise. The narrator does not support this proposition of compensation

²⁶ Tr. Braund 1992.

²⁷ See Dewar 1994 and Roche 2009: 1–10 on the issue of sincerity in the proem's praise of Nero.

throughout the rest of the epic; he fulminates instead against the monarchical government that resulted from the civil war. As Paul Roche has declared, “the general tendencies of the narrator are to cast his present political system as a condition of tyranny or monarchy or servitude, and to underscore explicitly that there is no end to this state.”²⁸ Virgil’s epic justifies the suffering of its characters through appeal to a future that Augustan readers already know has come to pass, whether or not they share the epic’s sense of its felicity. The *Bellum Civile* deprives Neronian readers of any sense of an enjoyable present or brighter future, and explains present-day suffering through appeal to the events of the recent past. Lucan’s epic continues Virgilian prophecy into a nightmarish present.

As in Ennius and Virgil, initial interaction with a ghost similarly determines the direction of Lucan’s epic.²⁹ In his epiphany to Aeneas, Virgil’s ghost of Hector indicates that continuation of Homer must involve the new story-pattern of migration and foundation, rather than continuing to fight the war at Troy. The image of the Patria who confronts Caesar at the Rubicon evokes Virgil’s ghost of Hector in her role as “representative of the nation”, her sadness and groaning, and her dishevelled appearance.³⁰ Yet while Aeneas eventually obeys Hector after some vacillation, the Patria cannot turn Caesar aside from his invasion. By descending from the Alps to invade his own country, Caesar is instead bringing to pass what a different ghost, Virgil’s Anchises, had foretold and then begged him not to do.³¹ Anchises urges Caesar “you first, you refrain, you who trace your ancestry to Olympus; throw the weapons from your hand, my blood!”³² Anchises’ protest against history is the example-model of what becomes a topos in Lucan’s epic. The narrator of the *Bellum Civile* frequently dramatizes “the conflict between the will to tell the story and the horror which shies from telling it.”³³ Lucan also evokes the connection made in Anchises’ prophecy between Caesar’s descent from Aeneas and his obligation to prevent harm to his country. Caesar acknowledges his Trojan descent on multiple occasions, yet draws quite different conclusions about the obligations it places

28 Roche 2009: 4.

29 See Bernstein 2011 on ghosts in the *Bellum Civile*.

30 See Roche 2009 ad Luc. *BC* 1.185–192.

31 Luc. *BC* 1.182 *iam gelidas Caesar cursu superauerat Alpes ~ Verg. Aen.* 6.829–831 *quantas acies stragemque ciebut, / aggeribus socer Alpinis atque arce Monoeci / descendens.*

32 *tuque prior, tu parce, genus qui ducis Olympo / proice tela manu, sanguis meus!*, Verg. *Aen.* 6.834–835.

33 See Masters 1992: 9.

upon him. Caesar's visit to the site of Troy emphasizes the contrast between Virgil's visions of the future and the horror related in Lucan's continuation of Virgilian history.³⁴

No extant historiographical source records a visit by Caesar to Troy immediately after the battle of Pharsalus. Whether the scene is Lucan's invention or an earlier product of the declamation schools is undecidable, as it is clearly modelled on the historically attested series of visits to Troy by previous conquerors such as Xerxes and Alexander.³⁵ The city in ruins resembles the devastated Italy of the epic's proem. What remains to be seen in the fantasy landscapes of both sites are sparsely populated piles of ruins overgrown with thornbushes (*BC* 9.966–969 ~ *BC* 1.24–29). Caesar almost inadvertently “tramples on Hector's ghost” (*manes / Hectoreos*, *BC* 9.976–977), an irreverent demonstration of the irrelevance of Virgil's prophetic narrative in the practical and disenchanting world that Caesar dominates. It is at that moment that the narrator makes one of his more famous interventions (one often excerpted out of context) in praise of the poet's ability to confer fame on the deeds of the past (*BC* 9.980–986). In doing so, the narrator once more puts himself both in competition with and in a state of dependence upon Caesar. Throughout the epic he has claimed to detest his character, but now he confesses that he cannot avoid him. He relies on Caesar's fame for the perpetuation of his own: “those coming after us will read you and me; our *Pharsalia* will live, and no age will doom us to the shadows” (*uenturi me teque legent; Pharsalia nostra / uiuet, et a nullo tenebris damnabimur aeuo*, *BC* 9.985–986). Continuation for Lucan means accepting the inevitability of his perpetuation of Caesar's fame.

In his prayer to the local gods, Caesar makes the strongest possible moves of affiliation with his Trojan ancestors. He addresses “the Lares of my Aeneas” (*Aeneaeque mei ... / lares*, *BC* 9.991–992) and identifies himself as “the most famous descendent of the Julian race” (*gentis Iuleae ... clarissimus ... nepos*, *BC* 9.995–996). His promise to the people of Ilium is a clear inversion of Roman priorities. After having destroyed his own people, he promises to “restore the population” to the empty site and rebuild the city's walls (*restituam populos ... Romanaque Pergama surgent*, *BC* 9.998–999). In terms of continuation of the *Aeneid*, Caesar's promises self-consciously contravene the agreement that Jupiter made with Virgil's Juno. She requested “Troy has fallen; may you permit that Troy has fallen with its name” (*occidit, occideritque sinas cum nomine Troia*,

34 See Tesoriero 2005, Spencer 2005, Wick 2004: 401–408, and Rossi 2001 for recent discussion of the Trojan episode.

35 See Wick 2004: 401–402.

Verg. *Aen.* 12.828). The devastation that Caesar earlier wreaked in Italy is now complemented by this undoing of the *Aeneid*'s negotiated peace between the gods. Lucan thereby underscores that Caesar is a far worse enemy of the Roman people than Juno or her Allecto ever could have been. The *Bellum Civile* thereby engages in the same moves of supplementation, repetition, and probing of the *Aeneid*'s ideological pressure points as Ovid's "Little *Aeneid*".

Silius Italicus' *Punica* and the Reenchantment of History

Silius Italicus' *Punica* was little read even by professional Latinists until quite recently.³⁶ One of the longest poems in classical Latin literature, it relates episodes from the second Punic War, with the gods whom Lucan had abolished now restored as major actors. This epic was often dismissed as derivative (as if other Roman epics were somehow not equally focused on the tradition), and criticism has been directed in particular at its methods of uniting mythological and historical material. Yet more recent readers have also viewed reliance on the tradition as empowering. The *Punica* continues the *Aeneid* on the narrative level by representing the second Punic War as both the continuation of the Trojan War and the working-out of Dido's curse on the Romans through her avenger Hannibal and her sister Anna. On the poetological level, the narrative places itself in the epic line of succession from Homer and Ennius.

The poem's opening scenes make explicit the association between Virgilian mythmaking and Roman historical narrative. Hannibal's father Hamilcar guides his son to swear an oath of eternal hostility to the Romans in Dido's temple in Carthage (*Pun.* 1.81–139). The Virgilian Dido's dying curse on Aeneas' descendants thereby becomes one of the causes for the narrative of a war set in historical times. Hannibal grows up to be the "avenger from [her] bones" (*nostris ex ossibus ultor*) whom Dido threatened "would harass the Dardanian settlers with fire and sword" (*qui face Dardanios ferroque sequare colonos*, Verg. *Aen.* 4.625–626). In a prophecy that occupies the same structural position as the Virgilian Jupiter's prophecy, Silius' Jupiter describes Hannibal's invasion as part of his plan to test the declining virtue of the Romans of the middle Republic by sending the greatest threat they have yet faced (*Pun.* 3.571–592).

In assisting the Carthaginian assault on Italy, Juno undoes her agreement with Jupiter at the end of the *Aeneid* to cherish the Romans (*Aen.* 12.808–

36 See Augoustakis 2010 for the history of reception of the *Punica* and the recent revival of interest in the epic.

828).³⁷ Her anger against the Romans in Silius' epic shows that her appearance of submission to her husband was in fact deceptive. The reader is thereby made to recall Virgil's divine council, where Jupiter indicates his awareness that Juno will support the Carthaginian invasion in time to come. In forbidding the gods to intervene in the war in Latium, Jupiter makes the following prophecy:

*adueniet iustum pugnae (ne arcessite) tempus,
cum fera Karthago Romanis arcibus olim
exitium magnum atque Alpīs immittet apertas:
tum certare odiis, tum res rapuisse licebit.*

VIRGIL, *Aeneid* 10.11–14

There will come a proper time for fighting (do not hold it off), when fierce Carthage, having opened the Alps, will send great destruction to the Roman citadels. Then you will be permitted to compete in hatred, to destroy states.

The Juno of the *Punica* remains unreconciled with the Romans at the end of the epic. Just as Silius draws on Jupiter's suggestion at the *Aeneid*'s divine council in making Juno the Romans' adversary, so he declines to create another equally spurious reconciliation scene for the goddess. For the god Proteus, one of the divine observers of the world-historical events transpiring in Italy, the Punic War is a predictable sequel of the Judgement of Paris (*Pun.* 7.435–493).³⁸ His narrative of Roman destiny echoes Jupiter's prophecy in its confirmation of the promise of empire without end,³⁹ but tracks a different course in its survey of historical specifics. Virgil's Jupiter skips the centuries from the founding of Rome to the birth of the Trojan Caesar and the advent of the Golden Age. In his speech, Roman history has an origin and a *telos* but no middle. Proteus instead takes the Virgilian chronology for granted and dwells on the narrative's immediate future, filling in part of the missing middle by continuing his narrative up to the destruction of Carthage in the third Punic War. His work of supplementation has broad similarities to Ovid's tales of primitive Latium: both fill out a picture that Virgil had sketched only briefly and indirectly.

37 See Feeney 1990.

38 For Proteus' prophecy as a new "Little *Aeneid*", see Perutelli 1997: 476. See Littlewood 2011: 163–168.

39 Sil. *Pun.* 7.478 *hic regna et nullae regnis per saecula metae* ~ Verg. *Aen.* 1.278–279 *his ego nec metas rerum nec tempora pono: / imperium sine fine dedi*.

Proteus' account makes the Romans' defence of their homeland the continuation of the Trojan War that Virgil's Diomedes had explicitly declined. Once resident in Apulia, he tells the Latin ambassadors that he will not fight Aeneas again (*Aen.* 11.252–293). But for Proteus, this claim turns out to be as specious as the Virgilian Juno's reconciliation. He announces "You, the ghosts of Aetolia, will fight again with the Trojans", in support of the Carthaginians at the pivotal battle of Cannae, an explicit echo of the Virgilian Venus' words at the divine council of *Aeneid* 10.⁴⁰ It misses the point to provide a rationalizing identification of these fighters as the descendants of Diomedes' followers, the peoples of southern Italy who historically supported the Carthaginian invasion. Silius' epic history describes the particular events of the Punic Wars as merely the latest variations of the unchanging patterns laid down in preceding poetic tradition.

As is typical in epic, Juno works through intermediaries to achieve her goals on earth. Her employment of Dido's sister Anna in book 8 of the *Punica* follows the Virgilian pattern of inventing a larger role for a minor character in a preceding epic. Anna assists Hannibal by telling him to give battle at Cannae, the high point of his invasion.⁴¹ Her desire to avenge her mistreated sister inclines her to favor Juno's request, even though she receives cult worship from the Romans and otherwise regards herself as now resident in an Italy inevitably Roman. Anna shares her need to accommodate conflicting obligations to family and country with many of the male characters of the *Punica*.⁴² The narrative accordingly guides the reader to view Anna as a more complex follower of Juno than her usual servants Iris and the Furies, one whose actions are embedded in a personalized human history.

The narrator explicitly marks the aetiology of Anna's new residence in Italy as a continuation of the unfinished business of *Aeneid* 4. He tells the tale of Anna's migration "from the beginning" (*ab origine*, *Pun.* 8.48), a beginning which he punctually locates "after Dido was deserted by her Trojan guest" (*Iliaco postquam deserta est hospite Dido*, 8.50). When Anna flees to Italy and encounters Aeneas, he wants to hear the answer to the question of what

40 Sil. *Pun.* 7.484 *Aetolae rursus Teucris pugnabitis umbrae* ~ Verg. *Aen.* 10.28–29 *atque iterum in Teucros Aetolis surgit ab Arpis / Tydides*. See Littlewood 2011: 185–186 on Diomedes in the *Punica*.

41 The authenticity of the passage in which Anna speaks to Hannibal is disputed (*Pun.* 8.145–225). I am inclined to tentatively accept it as genuine with Ariemma 2000.

42 For discussion of Anna, see Chiu 2011. For discussion of similar conflicts between family and state among the epic's male characters, see Bernstein 2008: 132–159, Bernstein 2010.

happened after his departure from Carthage (*Pun.* 8.76–78). This is the answer to the question that the Virgilian Aeneas asked Dido when he encountered her shade in the Underworld: “Alas! Was I the cause of your death?” (*funeris heu tibi causa fui?*, Verg. *Aen.* 6.458). Virgil’s Dido refuses to answer and flees with the ghost of her former husband Sychaeus, thereby leaving an opportunity for a later poet’s narrative supplement.

Silius represents the continuation of epic tradition on the poetological level by including the originators of Greek and Roman hexameter epic as characters in the *Punica*. His descriptions of their activity help to designate the space in the tradition for his new work. Ennius, author of the *Annales*, appears as a warrior on the battlefield in Sardinia (*Pun.* 12.387–419).⁴³ Apollo predicts that the poet will “be the first to sing of Italian wars in illustrious verse and elevate leaders to the sky” (*hic canet illustri primus bella Itala uersu / attolletque duces caelo*, *Pun.* 12.410–411). This designation of the goals of the first Latin hexameter epic poem echoes the narrator’s description of his most recent contribution to Roman historical epic: “I begin to sing of the arms by which the glory of the Aeneadae raises itself to the sky” (*ordior arma, quibus caelo se gloria tollit / Aeneadum*, *Pun.* 1.1–2).

Where Ennius’ appearance introduces a miniature history of the genre of Roman historical epic, Scipio’s subsequent encounter with the ghost of Homer in the Underworld advertises the need for a new Homer to celebrate the deeds of a new Roman Achilles.⁴⁴ He dreams of the dead poet singing about Roman accomplishments and creating a prestigious epic tradition for his descendants:

*“si nunc fata darent, ut Romula facta per orbem
hic caneret uates, quanto maiora futuros
facta eadem intrarent hoc” inquit “teste nepotes!
felix Aeacide, cui tali contigit ore
gentibus ostendi, creuit tua carmine uirtus.”*

Punica 13.793–797

If the Fates were now permitting that this bard would sing of the Romans’ deeds throughout the world, through what a witness would these deeds come to future descendants! Happy Achilles, it happened that such a mouth showed you to the nations, and your courage grew with the song.

43 See Casali 2006.

44 See Manuwald 2007.

Scipio's concluding acknowledgement of Achilles' good fortune reprises an old theme in Roman tradition: that deeds themselves, no matter how great, will not be remembered without a poet to guarantee their fame. Cicero attributes this observation to Alexander on his visit to Achilles' tomb, and Horace employs it as a justification of part of his panegyric project.⁴⁵ By causing Scipio to praise Homer and imagine a new role for him, Silius indirectly represents himself as the new Homer who will sing of the new Achilles.⁴⁶

Conclusion

Each allusion in a new poem to the words or phrases used by a predecessor in the tradition signals the potential for continuation of the earlier epic's narrative. Most such allusions are not continuations of the plot of the kind discussed in this chapter; they are rather smaller-scale evocations of images or themes. A later epic's development of an earlier epic's multiple plot strands are typically designed to affect our notions of narrative continuity and linearity. Remembrance of the earlier character or situation provokes the recognition of contrasts that are essential to the production of new works in a respected tradition. Virgil replaces Homer's Aeneas with a hero whose destiny has world-historical consequences. He accordingly makes the Homeric character whose fate still appears to be in play in Poseidon's prophecy during the Iliadic theomachy (Hom. *Il.* 20.293–308) seem quaint and parochial. As in the rest of the *Metamorphoses*, Ovid's tales set in primitive Latium assault Virgilian notions of decorum and narrative continuity. He expands a few Virgilian hints into a Latium populated by disappointed elegiac lovers, where metamorphosis is a norm rather than an exception. Lucan's *Bellum Civile* replays the Virgilian vision of the Golden Age as dystopia. Caesar's promise to rebuild Troy marks one of many points of rupture between the promises made by the Virgilian prophecies and the reality of the world that the descendants of Aeneas created.

In singing of Roman history, Silius self-consciously constructs a continuation of the mythological time of Virgil's *Aeneid* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses* and the historical time of Lucan's *Bellum Civile*. Jupiter's prophecy carries the narrative straight up to the poet's own era as it does in Virgil, but has no ringing endorsement of empire without end. He offers instead a bland promise that

45 Cic. *Arch.* 24, Hor. *Carm.* 4.9.25–28, etc.

46 As Bettini 1977 speculates, Silius may also reprise a theme of Ennius' *Scipio*, where the earlier poet may have indicated that only a Homer could offer appropriate praise of the commander.

the Romans will merely reign in their city “for a long time”, and the most distant future event in the prophecy is the deification of Domitian.⁴⁷ An epic written under the Flavian emperors has no investment in praising the Julio-Claudians, and so Jupiter skips straight over the reign of Augustus that Virgil had made into the Golden Age, as well as the dynasty of Caesars that Lucan had denigrated. His prophecy moves straight from Scipio’s victory over Carthage to the advent of the Flavian dynasty (*Pun.* 3.590–596). There are only brief references to the Flavian regime in the rest of the epic, however, as opposed to the frequent prefigurations of the Augustan age in Virgil’s *Aeneid*.⁴⁸ References to the moral corruption of the present day (*Pun.* 14.686–688), which Domitian’s vigilance can only do so much to correct, guide the reader to adopt a foreshortened perspective on the progression of history. At the worst possible moment for the Roman state, after the overwhelming defeat at Cannae, the narrator observes that “This was Rome then: if it stood fixed in Fate that its morals would change after you [fell], Carthage, would that you still remained!”⁴⁹ Continuation does not mean apocalypse: there is no Golden Age to come which will mean the end of history, only a better ruler who will briefly stave off progressive decline. There will accordingly always be narrative space for epic to continue.

Bibliography

- Ariemma, E.M. (2000). *Alla vigilia di Canne: commentario al libro VIII dei Punica di Silio Italico*. Napoli: Loffredo.
- Augoustakis, A. (Ed.). (2010). *Brill’s Companion to Silius Italicus*. Leiden: Brill.
- Barchiesi, A. (1993). Future Reflexive: Two Modes of Allusion and Ovid’s *Heroides*. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 95, 333–365.
- Bernstein, N.W. (2008). *In the Image of the Ancestors: Narratives of Kinship in Flavian Epic*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Bernstein, N.W. (2010). Family and State in the *Punica*. In A. Augoustakis (Ed.), *Brill’s Companion to Silius Italicus* (pp. 377–397). Leiden: Brill.
- Bernstein, N.W. (2011). The Dead and their Ghosts in the *Bellum Civile*: Lucan’s Visions of History. In P. Asso (Ed.), *Brill’s Companion to Lucan* (pp. 257–279). Leiden: Brill.
- Bettini, M. (1977). Ennio in Silio Italico. *RFIC*, 105, 425–447.

47 “For a long time”: *longumque tenebit*, *Pun.* 3.572; *longo regnabitur aevo*, 3.593. Deification of Domitian: 3.625–629.

48 See Mezzanotte 1995.

49 *haec tum Roma fuit: post te cui uertere mores / si stabat fatis, potius, Carthago, maneres*, *Pun.* 10.657–658.

- Braund, S.H. (1992). *Lucan: Civil War*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Casali, S. (1995). Altre voci nell' "Eneide" di Ovidio. *MD*, 35, 59–76.
- Casali, S. (2006). The Poet at War: Ennius on the Field in Silius's *Punica*. *Arethusa*, 39, 569–593.
- Chiu, A. (2011). *Generata e Sanguine*: The Motivations of Anna Perenna in Silius Italicus, *Punica* 8. *New England Classical Journal*, 38(1), 3–23.
- Dewar, M. (1994). Laying it on with a trowel: the proem to Lucan and related texts. *CQ*, 44, 199–211.
- Feeney, D.C. (1990). The Reconciliations of Juno. In S.J. Harrison (Ed.), *Oxford Readings in Vergil's Aeneid* (pp. 339–362). Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Fisher, J. (2012). *Visus Homerus Adesse Poeta*: The *Annals* of Quintus Ennius and the *Odyssey* of Homer. *Classical World*, 106(1), 29–50.
- Hannah, B. (2004). Manufacturing Descent: Virgil's Genealogical Engineering. *Arethusa*, 37(2), 141–164.
- Hardie, P.R. (1990). Ovid's Theban history: the first "Anti-Aeneid"? *CQ*, 40, 224–235.
- Hardie, P.R. (1993). *The Epic Successors of Virgil: A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hardie, P.R. (1997). Questions of authority: the invention of tradition in Ovid *Metamorphoses* 15. In T. Habinek & A. Schiesaro (Eds.), *The Roman Cultural Revolution* (pp. 182–198). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hardie, P.R. (2009). *Lucretian receptions: history, the sublime, knowledge*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hinds, S. (1998). *Allusion and intertext: dynamics of appropriation in Roman poetry*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hinds, S. (2001). Cinna, Statius, and 'Immanent Literary History' in the Cultural Economy. In E.A. Schmidt (Ed.), *L'histoire littéraire immanente dans la poésie latine* (Vol. 47, pp. 221–265). Geneva.
- Horsfall, N.M. (2000). *Virgil, Aeneid 7: a commentary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Horsfall, N.M. (2006). *Virgil, Aeneid 3: a commentary*. Leiden: Brill.
- Ingleheart, J. (2010). The literary 'successor': Ovidian metapoetry and metaphor. *CQ*, 60(1), 167–172.
- Littlewood, R.J. (2011). *A commentary on Silius Italicus' Punica 7: edited with introduction and commentary*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Manuwald, G. (2007). Epic poets as characters: on poetics and multiple intertextuality in Silius Italicus' *Punica*. *RFIC*, 135(1), 71–90.
- Marks, R. (2010). The Song and the Sword: Silius's *Punica* and the Crisis of Early Imperial Epic. In D. Konstan & K.A. Raafaub (Eds.), *Epic and history* (pp. 185–211). Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.
- Masters, J.M. (1992). *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's Bellum Civile*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

- Mezzanotte, A. (1995). Echi del mondo contemporaneo in Silio Italico. *RIL*, 129(2), 357–388.
- Moorton, R.F. (1989). The innocence of Italy in Vergil's *Aeneid*. *AJP*, 110, 105–130.
- Myers, K.S. (2009). *Ovid: Metamorphoses book 14*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Narducci, E. (2002). *Lucano. Un'epica contro l'impero: interpretazione della "Pharsalia"*. Roma: GLF editori Laterza.
- O'Hara, J.J. (1990). *Death and the Optimistic Prophecy in Vergil's Aeneid*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Papaioannou, S. (2005). *Epic succession and dissension: Ovid, Metamorphoses 13.623–14.582, and the reinvention of the Aeneid*. Berlin: De Gruyter.
- Perutelli, A. (1997). Sul manierismo di Silio Italico: le ninfe interrogano Proteo (7, 409–493). *BStudLat*, 27(2), 470–478.
- Quint, D. (1993). *Epic and Empire*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Roche, P. (2009). *Lucan De Bello Civili Book 1*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rossi, A. (2001). Remapping the Past: Caesar's Tale of Troy (Lucan *BC* 9.964–999). *Phoenix*, 55, 313–326.
- Skutsch, O. (Ed.). (1985). *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Spencer, D. (2005). Lucan's Follies: Memory and Ruin in a Civil-war Landscape. *G&R*, 52, 46–69.
- Syed, Y. (2005). *Vergil's Aeneid and the Roman Self: Subject and Nation in Literary Discourse*. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press.
- Tarrant, R. (2012). *Virgil: Aeneid Book XII*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Tesoriero, C. (2005). Trampling over Troy: Caesar, Virgil, Lucan. In C. Walde (Ed.), *Lucan im 21. Jahrhundert = Lucan in the 21st century = Lucano nei primi del XXI secolo* (pp. 202–215). München: Saur.
- Tissol, G. (2002). The House of Fame: Roman History and Augustan Politics in *Metamorphoses* 11–15. In B. Weiden Boyd (Ed.), *Brill's companion to Ovid* (pp. 305–335). Leiden: E.J. Brill.
- Toll, K. (1997). Making Roman-ness and the Aeneid. *CLAnt*, 16, 34–56.
- Wick, C. (2004). *M. Annaeus Lucanus. Bellum Civile Liber IX. Kommentar*. München: K.G. Saur.

Vegio's *Supplement*: Classical Learning, Christian Readings

Anne Rogerson

The *Aeneid* was first translated into a British language early in the sixteenth century, when the Scottish poet Gavin Douglas, later the Bishop of Dunkeld, rendered it in Middle Scots—all thirteen books of it.¹ He claims, however, in his prologue to Book 13, to have been under some duress when he tackled this final book, composed not by the Roman poet Virgil but by a fifteenth-century Italian continuator, Maffeo Vegio.² In its discussion of Douglas' anxieties about translating Vegio's work, Prologue 13 calls to the fore a number of early modern (and modern) concerns about the purpose and value of epic continuation. It also highlights an issue of great importance in Douglas' time and Vegio's, though much less in ours: the part played by pagan texts like Virgil's *Aeneid* in contemporary, Christian culture.³ This question, I will argue, lies at the heart of the *Supplement*'s engagement with the *Aeneid* as it recasts the Roman epic as a text to-be-continued. And so this chapter begins not with the once highly popular *Supplement* to the *Aeneid* but with Douglas' reflections on it and its translation.⁴ I will focus particularly on his stated reservations about his task in order to highlight an aspect of Vegio's continuation that has been relatively understudied in recent scholarship. This chapter will argue that the *Supplement* not only, as is increasingly acknowledged, makes a rich and sophisticated engagement with Virgil's epic, informed by and contributing to Renaissance humanist debates about the *Aeneid* and its heroes;⁵ it also engages with a medieval and

1 Douglas' translation was completed in 1513, shortly after the Battle of Flodden. It was first printed in 1553, just over thirty years after his death in 1522. He was Bishop of Dunkeld from 1515. I use the edition of Kendal (2011).

2 1407–1458. Vegio was a student at the University in Pavia when he composed the *Supplement* in 1428. He spent the last fifteen years of his life in Rome, where he became Canon of the Basilica of Saint Peter. For a fuller account of Vegio's biography, see Brinton (1930) 5–11.

3 For this question see Baron (1966) 291–331. The self-proclaimed moral virtues of the Renaissance commentator on Classical literature are explored by Di Cesare (1984).

4 On the popularity of the *Supplement*, see Brown and Kallendorf (1990). For the popularity (and moral interpretations) of epic in general, see Tanner (1993) 52–66.

5 Recent scholarship on Vegio's *Supplement* and Renaissance thought includes Kallendorf (1986) 100–128, Wilson-Okamura (2010) 239–250, Rogerson (forthcoming).

early modern, Christian tradition, which frames the understanding of Virgil's epic through a religious, not a secular, lens.

Douglas begins his discussion of the *Supplement* in Prologue 13 with the autobiographical story of a midsummer night's dream: he tells us that, having finished the translation of the twelve books of the *Aeneid*, he took a walk in the countryside where he fell asleep under a laurel tree as the evening star rose in the sky and a nightingale sang.⁶ A strange figure appeared, dressed in threadbare, outmoded garments and wearing a laurel wreath marking him as a poet "of the auld fashion" (Prologue 13.88). Douglas was about to have a classic poetic experience: the dream that inspires literary creation. This, however, was no Homer, handing on to a modern-day Ennius a poetic soul to act as a wellspring for a new epic, appearing like a blast from the past to aggrandize and legitimize the endeavours of an alleged poetic successor.⁷ Douglas claims to have thought that he was at the end of his task, not the beginning, his encounter is far from elevated in tone, and—as we shall see—its roots lie not in the Classical but the Christian tradition.

The dream vision upbraids the translator: "What does thou here / under my tree, and willest me nae good?" (76–77). The dreaming Douglas responds in confusion, asking who the apparition is and what he has done to offend. It is then that Douglas' interlocutor indignantly identifies himself:

'Knaus thou nocht Mapheus Vegius, the poet,
That unto Virgil's lusty books sweet
The thirteenth book eikit *Eneadane*?
I am the samen, and of thee naething fain,
That has the tother twelve into thy tongue
Translate of new, they may be read and sung
Ower Albion isle, into your vulgar leed;
But to my book yet list thee tak nae heed.'

Prologue 13.99–106

6 *Prologue* 13.1–75.

7 On the dream tradition in ancient literature and the influence of Ennius' dream of Homer on Latin poetry, see Hardie (1986) 76–83. The Ennian dream as a marker of poetic succession is also discussed by Goldschmidt (2013) 82, 166–168. For the popular medieval and Renaissance tradition of dreams inspiring literary creation, see Bawcutt (1976) 188–189. Douglas' dream is particularly close to Henryson's encounter with Aesop in his "Tale of the Lion and the Mouse": see Wingfield (2014) 167–168.

Begging his pardon, Douglas is full of excuses for his failure to translate Vegio's *Supplement* together with the *Aeneid*. He has, he says, spent a long time translating Virgil and now has other business to attend to (110–114). Next he adds that many people think Vegio's thirteenth book to be an unnecessary appendage to the *Aeneid*, contributing nothing more to the epic “than lanks to the cart the fifth wheel” (118). Thirdly, he argues, Vegio will, as a Christian, appreciate that Douglas fears for his soul after spending so much time intent upon pagan literature (119–130). Vegio is unimpressed by the first excuse and deals only tangentially with the second, which closely echoes the negative assessment of the *Supplement* made by the influential sixteenth-century commentator, Badius Ascensius.⁸ His focused ire is reserved for the third element in Douglas' attempts at self-exculpation, an excuse in which the Scots poet suggested that Vegio's work—like Virgil's—was pagan, and thus perilous to the soul. His argument is direct and unsubtle—Douglas is simply wrong because the *Supplement* is in fact a Christian text:

‘I let thee wit, I am nae heathen wicht;
And if thou has aforetime gane unricht,
Following sae lang Virgil, a gentile clerk,
Why shrinks thou with my short Christian work?’

Prologue 13.137–140

An apparently counter-intuitive proof of the Christian nature of Vegio's continuation of the *Aeneid* is then given, when the dream Vegio beats Douglas twenty times with his club till he cries for mercy and swears an oath to translate Vegio's thirteenth book “in honour of God / and his Apostles twelve” (150–151).

Douglas' dream encounter with an elderly and surprisingly violent Vegio has often been described as comic,⁹ and might be dismissed as a moment of slightly brutal early Tudor frivolity. It is, however, worth pausing over what may seem either an interlude of rustic light relief or a hint at Douglas' agreement with

8 The attack comes in the introduction to Ascensius' commentary on the *Supplement*: *Rutulos autem victores Aeneae subdidisse, Laviniam Aeneae nupsisse, diis sacrificatum esse, ob victoriam per se manifestaria sunt: unde frustra quidam quadrigis rotam quintam addidit*. (And that the conquering Rutulians should yield to Aeneas, that Lavinia should marry Aeneas, that there should be sacrifice to the gods, these things are perfectly clear from the victory itself: for which reason it is entirely in vain that someone should have added a fifth wheel to the four-wheeled chariot.) For Renaissance criticism of the *Supplement*, see Brinton (1930) 30–33. For the view that the *Aeneid* was unfinished, see O'Hara (2010).

9 E.g. Bawcutt (1976) 190, Ebin (1980) 362, Canitz (1990) 20, Pinti (1993) 328.

Badius Ascensius and others that the *Supplement* did not, indeed, merit translation, though he did translate it.¹⁰ For there is, in fact, a significant revelation about early modern understandings of the continuation offered to the *Aeneid* by the *Supplement* in the flyting exchange between Vegio and the beleaguered Douglas,¹¹ which will prove illuminating. This point is prepared for in the third of Douglas' reasons not to translate the *Supplement*, the peril the task poses to his Christian soul:

'I wit the story of Jerome is to you kend,
How he was dung and beft intil his sleep,
For he to gentiles' books gave sic keep.
Full sharp repreif to some is write (ye wist)
In this sentence of the haly Psalmist:
"They are corrupt and made abominable
In their studying things unprofitable".¹²
Thus sair me dreids I shall thole a heat
For the grave study I have sae long forleit.'

Prologue 13.122–130

Here Douglas refers to a well-known passage in the twenty-second of Jerome's letters, the epistle to Eustochium, in which the saint relates the dream which

10 This is the view of Canitz (1990) 21: "Douglas ... explicitly deflates all claims for the value which the supplement might have—literary, religious or otherwise—and makes it plain that he includes the thirteenth Book only *nolens volens* in order not to run afoul of popular taste and public demand." A similar reading of Douglas' *Prologue* 13 is hinted at in Thomas Twyne's introduction to the translation of the *Supplement* in his and Thomas Phaer's translation of the *Aeneid*, printed in 1573: "And whereas there is now made an accession of *Mapheus* xiii Booke, for that the same Auctour judged *Virgils* conceit not to be perfected in the former xii I have not done it upon occasion of any dreame as *Gawin Dowglas* did it into the Scottish, but mooved with the worthines of the worke, and the neerenes of the argument, verse and stile unto *Virgil*, wherin as I judge, the writer hath declared himself an happie imitatur." I use the edition of Lally (1987). Compare, however, Bawcutt (1976) 190: "this is all a humorous ploy; Douglas is making a show of being forced into something that he really wants to undertake."

11 The characterization of the interchange as "flyting" is made by Bawcutt (1976) 189. Pinti (1993) suggests that the exchange is primarily included to establish Douglas' authority.

12 An adaptation of Psalm 13.1, in which Douglas equates reading pagan texts with the denial of God: "The fool hath said in his heart, "There is no God." They are corrupt, and are become abominable in their ways. There is none that doth good, no, not one." I use the Douay-Rheims translation, as printed in Edgar and Kinney (2011).

persuaded him finally to abandon the study of the Classical literature he had initially been reluctant to give up upon his embrace of an ascetic life.¹³ In it, Jerome claims to have been brought before a divine Judge, accused of being a follower of Cicero and not of Christ, convicted and then beaten with scourges until he cried out for mercy and promised under oath never again to read the works of the gentiles. He woke, he says, black and blue and subsequently turned his zealous attention to the works of the prophets and the word of God.

In Prologue 13 Douglas takes this well-known case to heart, claiming to have neglected the translation of the *Supplement* due to his wish to avoid Jerome's mistake of turning away from God in his devoted study of the Classics. As we already know, however, Douglas is doomed to repeat Jerome's salutary experience almost exactly. He too is judged and found wanting by a figure in a dream, though he receives his beating not as a punishment decreed by God for spending so long on the pagan *Aeneid* but instead at the hands of the Christian continuator of Virgil's epic to whom he appealed, mistakenly as it turns out, in the name of Jerome. This slapstick episode at the beginning of Douglas' translation of Veggio's epic continuation is my first indication of an important aspect of the epic's reception in the early modern period which does not currently receive much scholarly attention: the Christian lens through which the *Aeneid* was read in the Renaissance, and the effect this had on shaping its continuation.

In Douglas' account of his dream encounter with Veggio he plays knowingly with tradition, even to the extent of having the Italian poet criticize him for his disingenuous and untruthful appeal to the sainted Jerome before he administers his beating.¹⁴ The dialogue between Douglas and Veggio has rightly been discussed as a sophisticated piece of literary criticism, as well as a humorous and learned contribution to the literary topos of creative inspiration through dreams.¹⁵ What has not been emphasized strongly enough, however, is the way in which the dream encounter between the two poets underlines Veggio's assertion that his *Supplement* is a "Christian work". When Douglas invokes Jerome, the *Aeneid* is quite explicitly categorized as a non-Christian text.¹⁶ This is a complex and tongue-in-cheek claim, since the prologues to each book of Dou-

13 *Letter* 22.30. A detailed description of Jerome's dream is given by Kelly (1975) 42–43. For the multiple allusions to Classical authors in the letter, see: Adkin (1992), (1994a), (1994b), (1997), (2003); Thierry (1963).

14 "Feigning him Jerome for to counterfeit", *Prologue* 13.135.

15 See in particular Bawcutt (1976) 188–190.

16 On late antique and early modern views that Virgil was himself a Christian author, see Wilson-Okamura (2010) 71–73.

glas' translation of the *Aeneid* resonate strongly with the medieval and Renaissance allegorical tradition which saw Aeneas' well-known labours as tests of his soul, and tended to view the hero himself as both a noble pagan and a Christ-like figure.¹⁷ Nonetheless, at the beginning of Prologue 13 the *Aeneid* is placed at the pagan end of a literary spectrum, however noble and prescient Virgil might have been. Somewhat paradoxically, the vigorous beating that Vegio administers in this same Prologue places his *Supplement* at the Christian end of the same spectrum. Douglas' Vegio is a "Christian man" and the author of a "Christian work,"¹⁸ and the twenty blows he rains upon the back of the errant Scots poet are a corrective to Douglas' presentation both of himself as a new Jerome and of Vegio's continuation as pagan literature. But if Vegio's *Supplement* is a Christian text, then—in imposing a Christian understanding of the trajectory and the hero of Virgil's pagan work—it makes the epic it continues Christian too, pulling the *Aeneid* across the imaginary line in the middle of the spectrum on which both works are placed. And as Vegio reshapes the *Aeneid* for the world in which the *Supplement* was written, his continuation becomes a valuable demonstration of how differently Virgil's epic was understood in the early modern past.

The Story of the *Supplement*

Before we turn to a detailed exploration of the Christian nature of Vegio's *Supplement*, we should briefly consider how this continuation moves from the end of the *Aeneid* to its own conclusion. Vegio's text starts at the moment the *Aeneid* ends, with Aeneas standing triumphant, his adversary Turnus dead at his feet. The emotions on display in the epic and its continuation, however, are very different. Where Virgil's Aeneas was enraged and terrible in his anger as he spoke his last words and plunged his sword into Turnus' chest (*furiis accensus et ira / terribilis*, *Aen.* 12.946–947), Vegio's hero is calm and measured when he begins to speak standing over Turnus' body (*tunc Turnum super adsistens*

17 For the Christian reading of the *Aeneid* Douglas promotes in his prologues, see Canitz (1990), Morse (1990) 113–114. Generally on Christian allegorical readings of the *Aeneid*, see Allen (1970) 135–162. As Brammall (2015) 28–37 shows, the other sixteenth-century translators of the *Aeneid* and Vegio's *Supplement* also presented Aeneas as a model of Christian virtue.

18 For Vegio's contemporary reputation as a "chaste and gentle poet" and a Christian, see Hieatt and Lorch (1977) 21–24.

placido ore profatur, 23).¹⁹ A preoccupation with calmness permeates the text, which speaks time and again of the peace and serenity longed for and now won by the Trojan and Italian people alike.²⁰ The persistent emphasis on and celebration of concord in Vegio's continuation reflects contemporary concerns with peace and political unity in Renaissance Italy.²¹ It is also a closural tactic, as can be seen very early in the *Supplement* when the Latins first pray for peace:

et veniam orare et requiem finemque malorum.

Supplement 12

And they pray for pardon, and peace, and an end to evils.

Here, and at several other places throughout the *Supplement*, Vegio's characters speak of the joys of a happy ending, highlighting how the continuation gives the *Aeneid* the conclusion it had wanted and struggled to achieve.²² Aeneas, for example, celebrates an end of toil, stressing finality by the use of both *finis* (end) and *meta* (end-point) in the same sentence (*iam finis adest: hic meta laborum / stabit*, 90–91).²³ Later, in response to miraculous fires that appear around Lavinia's head, he prays to Jupiter for an end to the evils of the Trojan people (*malisque imponite finem!*, 549). When asking Jupiter to impose a happy conclusion on the Trojans' story, Venus reminds him that he had promised such an end (*spondebas finem aerumnis rebusque salutem*, 598); and in his reply the god reaffirms that promise (*imposui finem*, 612) before decreeing that Aeneas should be elevated to the heavens. Peace, the cessation of troubles and endings

19 For the *Aeneid*, I use the edition of Conte (2009); for the *Supplement*, that of Putnam (2004).

20 Forms of *quies* and *requies* and their cognates appear at lines 12, 22, 77, 91, 104, 155, 160, 258, 263, 317, 453, 456, 548 and 554. *Pax* can be found as desire and achievement at lines 22, 154, 157, 318, 324, 326, 377, 382, 442, 453, 555, 577, 586 and 600. The adjective *placidus* recurs at lines 154, 314, 377, 415, 488, 548 and 578 (and in Brinton's (1930) edition also at lines 328, 423 and 442); *serenus* is found at lines 274 and 321; *concor*s at lines 387 and 592; *unanimis* at lines 321 and 365. Even the sun shines in a soothing manner: *aurato caelum splendore serenet*, 458.

21 Cummings (1995) 138, who goes on to argue that a similar preoccupation with peace and concord can be seen throughout Douglas' translation of the *Aeneid* and the *Supplement*. On Douglas' interest in "responsible leadership and just war" see Wingfield (2014) 176, who argues that the *Aeneas* is typical of old Scottish texts in its advisory nature.

22 On the self-conscious desire for an ending in the *Aeneid*, see Mitchell-Boyask (1996).

23 Note also mention of a *meta* elsewhere in the poem, variously associated with Turnus' *furor* (30–31), Turnus' toils (264) and the evils long endured by Aeneas (554).

are thus intertwined as the *Supplement* marks itself as a definitive conclusion to the *Aeneid*,²⁴ and suggests—through frequent references to the troubled yet hopeful Virgilian past—that the end it imposes, with Aeneas' pure essence made immortal and granted a place in heaven, is the only natural destination of Virgil's epic tale.

Various loose ends are tied off and closural gestures made as Vergio's continuation proceeds toward its final lines.²⁵ Aeneas puts the blame for war on Turnus' shoulders, absolving himself and Latinus of responsibility for the carnage of the last six books of the *Aeneid* (24–48).²⁶ The Trojans make a sacrifice to the gods in thanksgiving for their victory, at which Juno is declared no longer hostile to Aeneas' people (55–72).²⁷ Aeneas speaks first to Ascanius and then to the Trojan people, recollecting past sufferings and looking forward to happy days ahead (72–102).²⁸ Latinus points to the salutary moral of Turnus' turbulent, truncated life, dwelling on the transitory nature of earthly power and the folly of pride (145–184).²⁹ Turnus' body is carried off for burial in a

24 Buckley (2006) 114. A desire for *pax aeterna* is expressed in the *Aeneid* at 4.99, 11.356 and 12.504.

25 For closure in the *Supplement*, see Buckley (2006).

26 On the complexity of Vergio's representation of Turnus, see Rogerson (forthcoming).

27 *iam placidam et meliorem ingenti laude fatentur* (69). Note, however, that there is a slight element of wishful thinking here, and Juno had been placated with sacrifices before on the advice of the Tiber (*Aen.* 8.60–61) to no avail. Though in the *Supplement* the goddess does turn out to have become reconciled to the end of Aeneas' long trials (611–612), there is perhaps still some anxiety at this early stage of the continuation as to whether lasting peace really has been won for the Trojans. A further element of uncertainty about the final achievement of concord is also introduced by the somewhat boisterous abuse heaped upon the defeated Latins by Aeneas' troops as they leave the battlefield (*incusans acri ore Latinos / ignavosque vocans*, 53–54). The bitter tongues (*acri ore*) with which the Trojans speak here are not in step with the calm speech elsewhere that characterizes not only the virtuous Aeneas (*placido ore*, 23; *placida voce*, 84; *laeto ore*, 328) but also Latinus' people (*aequo ore*, 365; *laetam vocem*, 476), the cheerful guests at Aeneas and Lavinia's wedding (*laetae voces*, 53), Venus (*almo ore*, 551) and finally Juno (*amicas voces*, 622). Rather, they recall the *avido ore* with which the bird of prey attacks at 109, the baying hunting dogs silenced in obedience to their master (137, 140), and at the furthest extreme Turnus vomiting fire from his mouth like Cacus (351). Peace is the clear desire of Vergio's continuation; he also shows the heightened emotions which (still) have the potential to stand in its way.

28 On Aeneas and Ascanius in the *Supplement*, see Rogerson (2013).

29 On the speeches in the *Supplement* and their moralizing implications, see Kallendorf (1989) 100–128.

reworking of Pallas' funeral procession (185–203).³⁰ A great fire sweeps through Turnus' city Ardea, transforming it into a heron (210–240), whose changed form reflects the inalterably changed fortunes of a once proud city (*et cui sublimes stabant in moenibus arces, / mutata effusis nunc circumlabitur alis*, 237–238).³¹ Daunus mourns his son's death and his own pain (252–296), concluding that suffering is inevitable (*sic fata rotant res*, 296). Latinus prepares a wedding feast that repeats Dido's entertainment of Aeneas in Carthage, suggesting that the marriage between Aeneas and Lavinia is to overwrite his former unhappy relationship (302–324).³² Drances again attacks Turnus and praises Aeneas in extravagant terms, polarizing the two heroes of the *Aeneid* into symbols of vice and of virtue (331–373).³³ Aeneas appears to concur, and expresses his sure and certain hopes of fruitful, law abiding and peaceful days ahead (377–391). There is a funeral (394–401), and then a wedding (402–477), followed by the exchange of gifts (478–489), a celebratory banquet (490–508) and story-telling in which the histories of both the Trojans and the Italians are recounted once more (509–535) as previously in *Aeneid* 2, 3 and 7. A fire, as noted above, appears around Lavinia's head (540–542), equally astonishing as but far less threatening or ambiguous than the fires which appeared around Ascanius' head and the princess' own in the *Aeneid*.³⁴ Its good omen is confirmed explicitly by Venus (552–582), with emphatic reassurances of the glories ahead and none of the obfuscation around her own identity that characterized her interactions with Aeneas in *Aeneid* 1.³⁵ Finally Venus promises that Aeneas will go up to the heavens (*tum laetus ad altum / te mittes caelum*, 581–582), and in due course—after Latinus' demise and years of Aeneas' happy and peaceful rule over Italy and a combined Trojan and Italian population (587–592)—she works upon Jupiter to fulfil the promise made in the first book of the *Aeneid*.³⁶ The *Supplement* ends with the erasure of Aeneas' mortal remains and the conveyance of his soul to the heavens, as his Julian descendants worship him as the god Indiges and a Virgilian aetiological moment brings Veggio's continuation to a close (623–630).

30 Differing views on the implications of this echo can be found in Buckley (2006) 119–121 and Rogerson (forthcoming).

31 Here Veggio reworks Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 14.573–580; see further Henderson (2000).

32 Buckley (2006) 121–126.

33 Kallendorf (1986) 115–121. See also Hijmans (1971–1972).

34 *Aen.* 2.680–684 and 7.73–77. See further Rogerson (2013) 118–120.

35 Veggio stresses the goddess' openness and nurturing disposition: *se Venerem confessa almo sic edidit ore* (551).

36 *Aen.* 1.259–260.

Throughout the 630 lines of the *Supplement*, frequent verbal echoes of the *Aeneid* emphasize the close ties between the continuation and original text.³⁷ These allusions and borrowings also serve to underline the ways in which the *Supplement* fulfils the promises and hopes of Virgil's epic. An example may be found in Vergio's description of Aeneas' state of mind as he makes his soothing speech to the Trojans after they have retreated from the battlefield at the beginning of the book:

non secus Anchisa genitus mulcebat amicis
Troianos dictis, antiquum corde timorem
flagrantisque agitans curas et gaudia longis
tandem parta malis, et quae perferre molestum
ante fuit, meminisse iuvat.

Supplement 117–121

Just so Anchises' son soothed the Trojans with friendly words, meditating in his heart upon his long-held fear and burning concerns and the joys finally wrested from long suffering, and it delights him to remember what had in the past been grievous to endure.

Here multiple echoes of Virgilian diction underscore the claim that Aeneas is remembering past experience,³⁸ and we can note in particular the resonances with Aeneas' first speech to the Trojans after they have landed on Carthaginian shores:³⁹

['...]revocate animos maestumque timorem
mittite; forsan et haec olim meminisse iuvabit.'

Aeneid 1.202–203

37 These are detailed by Schneider (1985).

38 Brinton (1930) 161 lists: (i) moments in the *Aeneid* where Aeneas is spoken of as the offspring of Anchises (5.244, 5.424, 6.322, 6.331, 7.152); (ii) episodes where Aeneas soothes others with his words (1.197, 5.464, 5.770); (iii) statements of the long-standing nature of the hero's grief and fear (5.608, 7.365). Schneider (1985) 70 adds further parallels from the *Aeneid* and Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. Brinton also suggests an allusion to the martial agitation of Troy at *Aen.* 2.421 in Aeneas' agitated cogitation (*agitans*, 119) in the *Supplement*, but comparison with a scene of troubled reflection, such as at *Aen.* 8.18–21 seems more apt, despite the lack of verbal correspondences.

39 Schneider (1985) 70–71 also compares Seneca, *Hercules furens* 656–657 and Ovid, *Metamorphoses* 7.797–798 and 9.485.

'Rally your spirits and banish gloomy fear; perhaps one day it will be a joy to remember even these sufferings.'

The day for joyful remembrance of past sufferings has come in Vegio's epic continuation, as present tense joy (*iuvat*, 121) actualizes the future tense hope (*forsan ... iuvabit*, *Aen.* 1.203) expressed in the original text.⁴⁰ We see here too one of many instances in which happiness beams from Vegio's continuation, which is marked by its stress not only on peace and concord but also on joy.⁴¹ This is a significant transformation of the *Aeneid*, notorious for its stress on trauma, sadness and the "tears of things" (*lacrimae rerum*, *Aen.* 1.462). We have already seen how the turbulent emotions of the end of the *Aeneid* were made tranquil at the beginning of the *Supplement*; Vegio's emphasis on happiness is another way in which he significantly reshapes his source text as he imposes a literally happy ending upon Virgil's epic. Alongside this radical alteration, Vegio ensures that that which was broken or displaced in the *Aeneid* becomes whole again and finds a proper home in his epic continuation. So, for example, the union between Aeneas and Lavinia not only provides the hero with a wife but also the father he lost in the first half of the *Aeneid*, as he acknowledges explicitly when agreeing to marry the Italian princess:

'nunc adsum et patrem et socerum te laetus in omnis
accipio casus. magna mihi surget imago
Anchisae et rursum ardebo genitoris amore.'

Supplement 444–446

'Now I am here, and joyfully accept both father and stepfather, for better or for worse. Anchises' great image will rise up within me and again I will burn with the love of a father.'

The father-son relationship receives all the attention here, echoing similar emphasis on the importance of these bonds throughout the *Aeneid*. The implication that familial bonds are being restored is underlined by the echo here of

40 Reference to the function of memory underscores the allusion: see further Hinds (1998) 10–16.

41 Forms of *gaudium* and *gaudere* appear at lines 116, 119, 553 and 600. *Laetus* and its cognates are found at lines 36, 49, 287, 315, 363, 391, 403, 415 (in Brinton's edition only), 444, 459, 460, 476, 496, 530, 581 and 627: approximately three times the frequency with which they appear in the *Aeneid*.

Aeneas' earlier recollection of his love for his father when standing over the body of Lausus,⁴² one of the most poignant symbols in the *Aeneid* of the way in which war destroys young life and happy families.⁴³ Other examples of this tactic in the *Supplement* include Venus' promise that the long-travelled Penates, rescued from the fires of Troy in *Aeneid* 2, would embrace their new home in Lavinium, frustrating attempts to move them by returning themselves magically to the city (571–576);⁴⁴ and the repeated celebration of how the Trojans and Italians—at war in the *Aeneid* in a way which hints strongly at the discord and civil strife of the Roman republic⁴⁵—are in the *Supplement* to be made as one.⁴⁶

Aeneas in the *Supplement*

The greatest work of restoration and rehabilitation in Vegio's *Supplement* is its representation of Aeneas. Michael Putnam has noted that Vegio makes Aeneas, the somewhat troubling hero of the *Aeneid*, into “the emblem of Renaissance *virtù*, the combination of valour of body and excellence of mind which shapes the essence of the ideal Italian prince”.⁴⁷ Craig Kallendorf has demonstrated convincingly how the *Supplement* functions as an epideictic work in which a series of moralizing speeches establish Aeneas as a paradigm of virtue, duly rewarded for excellence as Turnus is punished for error, in a reflection of the contemporary Renaissance tradition “in which the *Aeneid* was interpreted as praise of virtue and condemnation of vice”.⁴⁸ Kallendorf and others have pointed out, too, how the presentation of Aeneas as a man of paramount virtue reflects Vegio's claim in a treatise on the moral education of children that “Virgil wished to demonstrate in the character of Aeneas a man endowed with every

42 *et mentem patriae subiit pietatis imago*, *Aen.* 10.824. Other allusions are listed in Schneider (1985) 108–109, including: *subiit cari genitoris imago*, 2.560; *genitor, tua tristis imago*, 6.695, and *genitoris amore*, 10.789.

43 For the disruption of families in the *Aeneid*, see also O'Sullivan (2009).

44 The story is not in Virgil or Livy, but preserved in Servius' commentary *ad Aen.* 1.270 and 3.12. It can also be found in Dionysius of Halicarnassus 1.67.1–2 and the *Origo gentis Romanae* 17.2–3.

45 See, for example, Marincola (2010) 183–193.

46 Rogerson (2013) 113–114. Note also the stress laid on Dardanus as a common ancestor to both the Trojan and Italian peoples during the stories of the past shared at *Supp.* 523–525.

47 Putnam (2004) xiii.

48 Kallendorf (1989) 101.

virtue, and to show him now in difficult and now in fortunate situations".⁴⁹ We have come to understand Vegio's Aeneas as a reflection of a strongly moralizing tendency in the interpretation of the *Aeneid* during the Middle Ages and Renaissance,⁵⁰ and also of a Renaissance reading tradition acutely aware of the less positive aspects of the hero's characterization and behaviour in the *Aeneid*, and at times deeply critical of his actions, toward Dido in particular.⁵¹

While the political and intellectual contexts in which Vegio was writing have received considerable and due attention, the influence of his Christian beliefs and of the Christian reading habits of the medieval and early modern periods have not been so thoroughly explored in modern scholarship. Indeed, Vegio's Christianity tends to be downplayed as a possible factor in the composition of the *Supplement* by Classical scholars in particular. They often cite Anna Cox Brinton's claim that Vegio saw the *Aeneid* as "above all an allegory of the soul",⁵² and sometimes note Don Allen's judgement that the new ending that Vegio's *Supplement* provides is "nearly Christian" and thus in accordance with Vegio's view that the *Aeneid* as a whole encoded "the highest mysteries of philosophy" and illustrated how to lead a virtuous life.⁵³ Intent, however, on pursuing different paths, modern secularizing readers give comparatively little weight to these observations.⁵⁴ Kallendorf quite rightly doubts that allegorical approaches to the *Supplement* alone "really anchor the poem firmly enough in fifteenth-century Italian culture to explain fully its development there".⁵⁵ Buckley traces Vegio's close engagement with the closural problems posed by the *Aeneid* and asserts that the poet is too clever and cultured to be a mere allegorist.⁵⁶ Putnam has tested the idea that Vegio's continuation is influenced by medieval allegorical readings of the *Aeneid* which see "the story of Aeneas

49 *Virgilius sub Aeneae persona virum omni virtute praeditum, atque ipsum nunc in adversis, nunc in prosperis casibus, demonstrare voluit, De educatione liberorum et eorum claris moribus*, 2.8. Kallendorf (1989) 102–103. See also Brinton (1930) 27–28.

50 Due in particular to the work of Kallendorf (1986).

51 Kallendorf (1999) and (2007).

52 Brinton (1930) 2.

53 Allen (1970) 141.

54 Ross (1981) dismisses them on the grounds that Vegio underwent some sort of religious conversion after he wrote the *Supplement*, and that he was also the author of "lusty lyrics" (216). Neither are strong arguments.

55 Kallendorf (1989) 101.

56 Buckley (2006) 110: "the sophistication and deliberation of Vegio's critical rewrite bespeaks not a medieval-minded unveiling of the *integumentum* that concealed the true spiritual meaning of the *Aeneid*, but rather a forwards-looking and typically humanist manipulation of words for his own ends."

as emblemizing the journey of man bettering himself as life progresses and, anagogically, of the soul's quest for ethical perfection ending in its claim to a seat with the saints in heaven"⁵⁷ by showing in detail how indebted the end of the *Supplement* is to two key passages in Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, namely the ascent of Aeneas to the heavens (*Met.* 14.597–608) and the deification of Julius Caesar (*Met.* 15.840–848).⁵⁸ His conclusion is forcefully expressed:

On the occasion [*i.e.* the description of Aeneas' immortal soul being translated to the heavens] when Vegio would be expected to add even an indirect Christian element to Aeneas' final progress not only is nothing forthcoming but his language is almost completely dependent on his great Roman predecessors. This is as if to say that it is in the classical literary background that his interest lay and that such should be the focus of attention for his contemporary readers as well.⁵⁹

Though Putnam is right that Vegio does not overtly refer to God's grace or place Aeneas' soul explicitly in a Christian heaven, there is some reason to question his assertion of Vegio's "unwillingness to allow interpretation of his poem to take the step toward anagogy".⁶⁰ If this was Vegio's wish, then some of his Renaissance readers at least seem to have disobliged him: we have already seen how Douglas, the Scots translator, showed Vegio in vigorous defence of his "Christian work" against claims of its corrupting, pagan nature. Moreover, sustained engagement with the *Metamorphoses* need not preclude an interpretation of Vegio's work that allows for a Christian allegorical meaning as well as a masterful display of Classical learning. In the fourteenth century, for example, the *Ovide Moralisé* was one of several widely-read works which explained the hidden Christian and moral meanings of the *Metamorphoses*.⁶¹ Translations of the text into Old French were followed by lengthy passages of exegesis.⁶²

57 Putnam (2004) xiii.

58 Putnam (2004) xiv–xvii.

59 Putnam (2004) xviii. The following paragraph reiterates this point in even stronger terms, concluding that Vegio "avoids any step that would lead the reader toward any medieval, anagogical interpretation of the hero's life" and "is inexorably classicizing" (xviii).

60 Putnam (2004) xviii.

61 See further Zeeman (2016) 151–153. Another was the *Ovidius Moralisatus* by Pierre Bersuire, several copies of which, along with other allegorizing works on the *Metamorphoses*, were in the library of the Visconti and the Sforza, Dukes of Milan, to whom Vegio dedicated several works. See Pellegrin (1955) A.101, A.195, A.352, A.632.

62 The whole work is over 65,000 lines long.

Aeneas' ascent to the heavens is explained through the intercession of Christ, who sees in the Roman hero not only a model of virtue but a champion of the Church.⁶³

Lors que l' amoureuse pitié
 Et la piteable amistié
 Dou fil Dieu vit son fil, Enee,
 C'est à dire sa char penee,
 En diverses paines au monde
 Et vit que ja fu sor l'esponde
 De la foi de crestienté,
 Et bien furent entalenté
 Si disciple preus et vassaulz
 A souffrir les mondains assaulz,
 Et que tous le jors à devise
 Croissoit la fois de sainte Yglise
 Aus simples gens qui le sivoient
 Et à son exemple vivoient,
 Si pria Dieu, le poissant Pere,
 [...]
 Quar ce fu don commun acort
 De tous trois, sans nul desacort,
 Que li cors fust deïfiez
 Et par tormens glorefiez,
 Quar il avoit bien deservie
 L'onor de pardurable vie.

L'Ovide moralisé 14.4671–4697

When the loving pity and the pitying love of the Son of God saw His son, Aeneas, which is to say His own flesh, do penance in the varied sufferings of the world and saw that already there was sure hope of the Christian faith, and that there were such valorous disciples and vassals desiring to suffer the trials of the world, every day taking as their motto the increase of the faith in the Holy Church among the simple people who followed Him and who lived according to His example, so He prayed to God, the powerful Father [...] and so it was granted in common accord by the

63 I use the text of De Boer (1938). I am grateful to John Gagne and Jenny Gautun for their generous help with the translation.

Trinity, with no discord, that Aeneas' heart be deified and by torments glorified since he had well deserved the honour of eternal life.

Similarly, Caesar's deification in *Metamorphoses* 15 is explained as a sign of the triumphant power of God, the Lord of hosts and of battles.⁶⁴ As these examples show, Vegio and other humanists who read and quoted the *Aeneid* and the *Metamorphoses* in the early modern period were working within a tradition deeply imbued in the habits of cultural appropriation of Classical texts. It is possible that these habits were so ingrained that it was not always necessary to spell out the moral and religious messages associated with these canonical Classical epics, and that what we should look for in Vegio's representation of a virtuous Aeneas and his just reward is not an assertion as explicit as is found in the *Ovide Moralisé* but something more subtle. As the remainder of this chapter will suggest, Vegio's representation of Aeneas is shaped not only by his knowledge of the *Aeneid* and contemporary scholarship on Virgil's text but also by the assumptions he makes as an educated Christian reader of Classical literature. Acknowledging these allows us further to appreciate the ways in which the *Supplement* is a product of its times, a continuation of the *Aeneid* that is both a learned and a Christian work.

Let us turn first, however, to the virtues of Vegio's Aeneas, which thoroughly permeate the text. He is addressed by Latinus as the dazzling light of the Trojan race,⁶⁵ and a host of positive adjectives describe him throughout: *magnanimus*, *magnus*, *potens*, *bonus*, *pius*, *optimus* and *maximus* are all seen, often several times.⁶⁶ Though powerful, he is also gentle,⁶⁷ and is presented as the mildest of heroes.⁶⁸ The "great-souled" hero is thus duly mindful of the importance of reverence to the gods above all else,⁶⁹ and is loved by Jupiter.⁷⁰ He is concerned

64 *L'Ovide Moralisé* 15, 7177–7196. Later, Augustus is explained as a representation of the Son of God. See Delany (1972) 101. Note also parallels drawn by early modern thinkers between the doctrine of the resurrection and passages from both *Aeneid* 6 and *Metamorphoses* 15, discussed by Wilson-Okamura (2010) 181–185.

65 *lux Troianae clarissima gentis* (425).

66 *magnanimus*: 3; *magnus*: 345, 372, 434, 451, 603, 621; *potens*: 102, 304, 589, 607; *bonus*: 327, 440; *pius*: 375, 406, 588; *optimus*: 463; *maximus*: 537.

67 Note for example *hilari cum fronte* (375) and *amico pectore* (376).

68 *ante omnes mitior unus* (72).

69 See for example 28, 57–58, 123–124, 544–547. The translation of *magnanimus* as "great-souled" is by Putnam (2004). The same adjective is applied to Aeneas' descendants at line 560.

70 608.

for his people and about the proper burial of the dead,⁷¹ and upon Latinus' death becomes the best of leaders, ruling a united and law-abiding Italy.⁷² He is a model both of *virtus* and of *pietas*, and instructs his people to follow his example.⁷³ Indeed, he is as conspicuous for his virtues as he is for his towering stature, regal poise and lambent gaze.⁷⁴ His fame is of galactic proportions,⁷⁵ all Italy exalts him with praise to the point of worship,⁷⁶ and when he speaks his *pietas* elicits awestruck wonder:

dixerat, et tanto affatu conversa tenebant
ora simul stupefacti omnes et apertius ingens
mirantes pietatis opus.

Supplement 392–394

Aeneas had spoken, and they held their faces turned toward him, united in their astonishment at his striking speech, all of them even more openly wondering at the great manifestation of his *pietas*.

Such is his *virtus*, shared by his descendants, that it makes him (and them) worthy of a place among the heavens.⁷⁷

All this may be no more than evidence of Vegio's wish to present Aeneas "as the noblest of pagans, and accordingly worthy even of divinization".⁷⁸ But one passage in the text suggests that Vegio's superlatively virtuous hero is more than simply a noble and redeemable pagan, and instead is to be seen as a type of Christ. The suggestion comes in an extraordinary simile describing Aeneas' love for his Trojan troops and his delight that they have finally escaped the peril that has long loomed over them:

71 Concern for his people: 103–124; for the dead: 55–56, 388–390.

72 588–592.

73 98–99. On the source for and implications of these lines, see Rogerson (2013) 114–115. Aeneas is also said to surpass everyone in *virtus* at 122–123 and in *pietas* as well as martial prowess at 332–333. His *virtus* is shared by Lavinia (469) and by their descendants (562). For Renaissance understandings of Aeneas' *pietas*, see Wilson-Okamura (2010) 196–199.

74 *spectatum virtute ducem*, 310. For Aeneas' impressive physicality, see lines 419–421. The civilian inhabitants of Latinus' city are keen to see him and particularly impressed with his qualities (451–452).

75 *unum omnes Itali super aurea mittunt / sidera* (359–360).

76 *te tota precatur / Ausonia et claris praestantem laudibus effert* (366–367).

77 See in particular 566, 605 and 617–619.

78 Putnam (2004) xix.

[...] velut exiguis cum ex aethere gyrans
 incubuit pullis et magno turbine milvus
 insiliens avido ore furit stragemque minatur,
 tum cristata ales concusso pectore mater
 consurgit misero natorum exterrita casu,
 rostrum acuit totisque petit conatibus hostem
 et multa expulsum vi tandem cedere cogit,
 dehinc perturbatos crocitans exquirat et omnes
 attonitos cogit pro caris anxia natis
 et tanto ereptos gaudet superesse periclo

Supplement 107–116

Just as when a kite whirling from the sky comes threatening over her tiny chicks, leaping at them with a great hurricane of flapping and a ravenous mouth, raging and threatening a massacre, then the crested mother hen rises up, her heart shaken with terror at the wretched plight of her young, sharpens her beak and makes for the enemy with all of her effort, and forces it at last to yield, driven out with much force, and afterwards, cackling, she searches out her distressed brood and gathers them all together in a stupefied flock, concerned for her dear children, and she rejoices that, wrested from such great danger, they have triumphed.

The closest parallel for this simile in the Classical tradition is Achilles' claim that he has been like a mother bird bringing every morsel to her chicks and taking no food herself as he fought selflessly for the Greeks and an ungrateful Agamemnon at Troy.⁷⁹ A much closer analogue, however, can be found outside the Classical tradition—Christ's expression of his concern for the people of Jerusalem, which appears in the gospel of Matthew:⁸⁰

79 *Iliad* 9.323–327. There are also some verbal parallels, as noted by Schneider (1985) 69, with Ovid, *Met.* 2.716–719, where Ovid compares Apollo flying over the beautiful Herse to a kite circling over entrails on an altar.

80 See also Luke 13:34, where the description of the bird and its young is slightly different: *quemadmodum avis nidum suum sub pennis*. In the Greek New Testament, the bird in both cases is an ὄρνις, a domesticated hen. Brinton (1930) 154 notes the similarity between Vegio's simile and these verses, but as Tudeau-Clayton (1998) 521 and n. 51 notes, the trail has not been further pursued.

Jerusalem, Jerusalem, quae occidis prophetas, et lapidas eos, qui ad te missi sunt, quoties volui congregare filios tuos, quemadmodum gallina congregat pullos suos sub alas, et noluisti?

Matthew 23:37

Jerusalem, Jerusalem, thou that killest the prophets and stonest them that are sent unto thee, how often would I have gathered together thy children, as the hen doth gather her chickens under her wings, and thou wouldst not?

The passage would have been familiar to any educated fifteenth-century western Christian, forming part of the gospel *lectio* during the celebration of the Feast of St. Stephen on December 26. The comparison it contains is a common one in Rabbinical literature,⁸¹ and the image of shelter under God's wings can be found in various locations in the Old Testament.⁸² Writing around the turn of the ninth century, the prolific and influential Smaragdus of Saint-Mihiel comments on the New Testament passage, demonstrating the popular understanding among Christian thinkers of late antiquity, the Middle Ages and beyond of the image of a hen and her threatened chicks, and—as Veggio also does in the *Supplement*—inserting an aggressive kite into the scene:

dulcissima similitudo qua se Christus gallinae comparat, nos pullis, per quem solum a milvis, hoc est, diabolis, liberi evadimus

Patrologia Latina 102.555b

A most delightful simile, in which Christ compares himself to a hen and us to her chicks—Christ, by whom alone we, his children, escape from kites, that is, from devils.

The equations of Christ to the mother hen, the chicks to the Christian congregation, and the malevolent kite to the devil become a commonplace in patristic writing, particularly in commentaries on the Psalms.⁸³ A commentary attributed to Jerome on Psalm 16:8 and Augustine's commentary on Psalm 62:8

81 Plummer (1901) 352.

82 Davies and Allison (1997) 320 and n. 58.

83 Among others, the comparison is elaborated by Heiric of Auxerre (*PL* 95.1171d–1172b), Werner of St. Blaise (*PL* 157.1092d), Honorius of Autun (*PL* 172.1050d), Garner of St. Victor (*PL* 193.82d) and Gerhoch of Reichersberg (*PL* 194.189b and 557d).

each lend the weight of their considerable authority to the exegesis,⁸⁴ and there can be no doubt that this reading was known to Vegio, whose knowledge both of Classical literature and the writings of the Church fathers is demonstrated throughout his works.⁸⁵

Vegio's use of the imagery of the hen, her chicks and the kite thus indicates that he presents Aeneas in the *Supplement* not only as a paradigm of virtue, but also as a type of Christ. The familiarity of this interpretation suggests that the Christian associations of the passage would not have been lost upon his Renaissance readers. Further encouragement for a reading of Vegio's Aeneas as shaped by Christian imaginative associations can be found elsewhere in the *Supplement* too, in other passages where Vegio pauses for a close look at his virtuous hero. When Aeneas receives the deputation led by Drances, for example, he does so with a jovial countenance (*hilari cum fronte*, 375) that is unparalleled in the *Aeneid* but well-attested in the Latin Vulgate where, for example, the congregation is urged to give gifts with a cheerful expression (*hilarem fac vultum tuum*, *Ecclesiastes* 35:11) and those of good heart are said to look happy at all times (*cor bonum in omni tempore vultus illorum hilaris*, *Ecclesiastes* 26:4).⁸⁶ The friendly heart (*amico pectore*, 376) with which the hero then greets the Italians is also much more commonly found in patristic writing than among Classical authors.⁸⁷ Even more striking, however, is Vegio's description of Aeneas as mild, indeed as milder than anyone else (*ante omnes mitior unus*, 72). There is little mildness in the *Aeneid* and it cannot be said to be a quality for which any hero of Classical epic is renowned.⁸⁸ In the Biblical tradition, however, there is one

84 The Hieronyman commentary expands also on the exact implications of the hen's wings, reading them as a symbol of the Old and New Testament, protecting the Church (the chicks) from the devil as kite (*PL* 26.860c–d). Augustine specifically quotes Matthew 23:37 in his exegesis (*PL* 36.757–758).

85 See Fanning (1933) xviii for lists of the Classical and Christian authors quoted by, and likely to have been known to, Vegio. His education is detailed by Brinton (1930) 8–10 and Fanning (1933) ix–xii. For the intellectual, humanist circles in which Vegio moved see Brinton (1930) 17–24.

86 Compare also Proverbs 15:13 and 16:15, Psalms 103:15.

87 A single friendly heart is pierced by love at Ovid, *Ars Amatoria* 3.737. Compare the friendly hearts extolled, among others, by Bede (*PL* 92.303d and 94.689), Ennodius (*PL* 63.24c), Fulbert of Chartres (*PL* 141.209b) and Rabanus Maurus (*PL* 112.1588d and 1601b).

88 The Tiber is mild (*mitis*, *Aen.* 8.88) as it gentles its usually tumultuous flow to allow Aeneas passage upstream to the future site of Rome (*Aen.* 8.86–89). The only other mildness in the *Aeneid* is found in the future predicted by Jupiter, when the ages rough with war will grow peaceful (*aspera tum positae mitescent saecula bellis*, *Aen.* 1.291).

man well known for his extraordinary mildness: Moses, who is said to have been “a man exceeding meek above all men that dwelt upon earth” (*erat enim Moses vir mitissimus super omnes homines qui morabantur in terra*, Numbers 12:3). In this mildness, Moses resembles God, “sweet and mild and plenteous in mercy” (*suavis et mitis, et multae misericordiae*, Psalm 85:5).⁸⁹ He is also like Christ, who admonishes his followers to “learn of me, because I am meek and humble of heart” (*discite a me, quia mitis sum, et humilis corde*, Matthew 11:29).⁹⁰ Vegio's Aeneas, the one man in the *Supplement* who is milder beyond all others, is thus both like Christ and like Moses, and a significant part of what makes him an ideal of virtue for Renaissance readers is the fact that he so closely mirrors these Biblical heroes.⁹¹

Physically, too, Vegio's Aeneas appears Christ-like. When he comes to Latinus' city his impressive appearance fulfils all the hopes of the citizenry:

namque omnes super excellens atque altior ibat
et late regalem oculis spargebat honorem
sidereis.

Supplement 419–421

For he surpassed all the rest and was taller as he strode along and far and wide sparkled the kingly glory from his starry eyes.

Aeneas' starry eyes have no close antecedent in Virgil or other Classical writers, but instead echo a tradition found in the writings of the Church fathers. Jerome argues twice that “unless Jesus had had something starry in his face and in his eyes the Apostles would never have steadfastly followed him” (*nisi enim habuisset et in vultu quiddam oculisque sidereum, numquam eum statim secuti fuissent Apostoli*, *PL* 22.627 and 26.152d). This statement is quoted by Bede, Rabanus

89 This is the Gallican psalter version of this verse (the one normally used in Books of Hours and in prayers), see Bernard (1911) for the text and Edgar and Kinney (2011) xxix–xxx for its popularity.

90 Note also the echo of Christ's *discite a me* in Aeneas' *discite me et pietate sequi* (learn also to follow me in piety) at *Supp.* 99.

91 *contra* Long (1931) whose review of Brinton is cited by Ross (1981): “There is nothing in XIII to lend such [Christian allegorical] colour, except the hasty apotheosis at the close. A study of the epithets for Aeneas lends no support” (549). On the popularity of Moses as a representative of an ideal ruler and law-giver in the Renaissance, see Foster (2014). Aeneas' role as law-giver is stressed at *Supp.* 592.

Maurus and many of the other Church fathers:⁹² its ubiquity across the full range of early Christian writing in Latin suggests that it too was probably known to Vegio, and a likely source for his depiction of a supremely virtuous Aeneas, revered as a bringer of peace and example of outstanding virtue.

With the Christian framework in which Vegio constructs Aeneas' character in mind, I turn now to the concluding section of the *Supplement*, where the poet describes Aeneas' soul being taken up to the heavens. Following an appeal made by Venus, the hero's elevation is approved by Jupiter, with the following instructions and promise:⁹³

[...] tu, si quid in ipso
mortale est, adime, atque astris ingentibus adde.
quin si alios sua habet virtus, qui laude perenni
accingant sese et gestis praestantibus orbem
exornent, illos rursum super aethera mittam.'

Supplement 615–619

'If there is anything mortal in him, you remove it, and place him among the mighty stars. And if his virtue takes hold in others, who furnish themselves with everlasting praise and adorn the world with their outstanding achievements, then I will send them in turn beyond the upper air.'

As Michael Putnam has shown, the injunction that Venus should remove anything mortal from Aeneas and her subsequent fulfilment of this command, as she has the river Numicius wash away Aeneas' mortal parts, are deeply indebted to the description of Aeneas' deification in the *Metamorphoses*.⁹⁴ Jupiter's additional promise, however, that all those who follow Aeneas in *virtus* will be similarly rewarded with a place in the heavens does not have such close Classical antecedents and is more reminiscent of the theology of redemption than of Virgil's forecast of the earthly glory of Aeneas' imperial descendants.⁹⁵ Similarly, there is an inescapably Christian overtone to the Christian

92 See *PL* 2.772c, 92.92c, 99.456b, 105.1014c, 106.1433b, 107.1043c, 114.153c, 120.712a, 120.1017b, 169.294a, 186.369c, 212.578d.

93 The pattern of an appeal by Venus and the consequent reiteration of a promise by Jupiter follow those in *Aeneid* 1.227–295; the ring composition adds further to the impression that Vegio's *Supplement* brings the *Aeneid* to a close.

94 Putnam (2004) xiv–xv.

95 Only the mysterious "Caesar" of *Aeneid* 1.289–290 follows Aeneas up to the heavens, due to his martial achievements.

Vegio's description of a joyful Venus bearing Aeneas' fresh and fortunate soul aloft (*laeta recentem / felicemque animam secum super aera duxit*, *Supp.* 627–628), adding a contemporary nuance to verbal echoes of Virgil's descriptions of souls in the underworld.⁹⁶ The *anima felix* (fortunate soul) of the Christian believer is a commonplace in patristic texts, and the impression that Aeneas here is a model for a virtuous Christian,⁹⁷ offering hope of eternal life, is further strengthened by the ways in which Venus' role, placing Aeneas among the stars in the penultimate line of the poem (*immisitque Aenean astris*, *Supp.* 629), echoes the belief sometimes seen in the Middle Ages that the Virgin Mary not only acted as an intermediary between the Christian congregation and God, interceding on the behalf of penitent sinners, but could also help to guide souls up to heaven.⁹⁸

A reading of Vegio's ending along these lines is strongly hinted at by the woodcut which illustrated the final lines of the text in the 1502 edition of Virgil's works printed by the humanist scholar Sebastian Brant. These woodcuts were intended to be exegetical, as an introductory poem makes clear.⁹⁹ In particular, they were intended to point out the moral message of the poems they accompanied, for the benefit of a relatively unlettered audience.¹⁰⁰ They thus offer an invaluable window into how an erudite near-contemporary of Vegio's understood his text and thought it should be presented to a contemporary audience. Six nearly full-page woodcuts illustrate the *Supplement*. The last is associated with the final lines of the text, and shows a number of scenes from the conclusion to Vegio's poem.¹⁰¹ At the top left Lavinia and Ascanius (both labelled) stand with an unidentified older man outside a city. In the centre Jupiter, dressed only in a loincloth and holding a sceptre in his left hand, leans

96 Souls are fresh (*recentes*) at *Aen.* 6.341 and fortunate (*felices*) at *Aen.* 6.669.

97 Pinti (1993) 341–342 notes that Gavin Douglas' translation describes Aeneas here as "ruthful", further hinting at such a reading. For Douglas' emotional and ruthless hero, see further Gray (2001) esp. 29. Another indication of the contemporary understanding of the end of the *Supplement* is given by Ross (1981) 218 who details how the twelve-line verse synopsis attached to the *Supplement* echoes verse prefaces to medieval saints' lives in its statement that the blessed (*beatus*) Aeneas finds his end among the stars.

98 See, for example, Clayton (2003) 106–108. For Mary as intercessor, see Rubin (2009) 116–117, 132–134, 224.

99 Patterson (1987) 92–94.

100 Much of the poem is taken up with praise of artists of the ancient world, who knew how to depict morals and character (*qui pingere mores / novit*).

101 A high-resolution scan can be found in the digital resources offered by the Universitätsbibliothek Heidelberg, at <http://digi.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/diglit/vergil1502/0843>.

against a rock, with a naked Venus kneeling at his feet, looking up at him as she clasps his foot and lower leg in supplication. Below her and to the right, Latinus is seen on his funeral pyre. In the bottom left-hand corner Aeneas lies prone on a river-bank with his hands clasped over his groin and dressed like Jupiter only in a loincloth. Venus stands in the river by his side, watching over him with a concerned expression as a tiny soul, in the form of a naked miniature person, its hands folded before it in prayer, emerges from his mouth. Both Jupiter and Aeneas, so similarly clad, are strongly reminiscent of depictions of Christ as the Man of Sorrows frequently seen in medieval woodcuts, and Aeneas' tiny nude humanoid soul recalls the souls leaving the mouths of dead Christians in medieval and Renaissance art.¹⁰² The illustration suggests, as I have argued above that the *Supplement* does too, that Vegio's Aeneas is to be seen both as a Christ-figure and as a model Christian, a son who strongly resembles his divine Father. Accompanied by a mother who in her posture and appearance iconographically recalls both the Virgin Mary and Mary Magdalen, Brant's vision of Vegio's Aeneas strongly promotes an understanding of the *Supplement* coloured and informed by the Christian culture and its conventions of expression within which Vegio lived and worked.

The *Supplement* offers to the *Aeneid* a continuation in which Classical learning and Christian reading practices are intertwined. It is a text of its time, written by a prodigiously talented and highly educated humanist, whose learning encompassed the Latin Vulgate and the writings of the Church fathers as well as the literature of ancient Rome. In some ways, it is quite a familiar poem to a modern Classical audience: sophisticated and dense intertexts mark its close engagement with earlier Latin poetry, and we can see hints too of patterns of reading in the Renaissance similar to our own—in particular, as I have argued elsewhere, in Vegio's sympathetic treatment of the character of Turnus.¹⁰³ The manner and means in which Vegio appends an ending to the *Aeneid* also conform to the expectations of modern reading audiences about closure and how it is imposed.¹⁰⁴ The moralizing and Christian strand in the text, however, is unfamiliar—so unfamiliar that it has not yet been fully appreciated by Classicists, though scholars working on Gavin Douglas' translation and the reception of Virgil in the English Renaissance have been more attuned to its possibilities.

102 Compare, for example, the souls depicted as naked babies being fought over in the fourteenth-century fresco "The Triumph of Death" in Pisa, on which see Carletti and Polacci (2014) 99–101.

103 Rogerson (forthcoming).

104 See Buckley (2006), with Fowler (1989) and Hardie (1997) on closure in Latin epic.

The story of the *Supplement* in scholarship shows us how much we still have to understand about the ways in which Classical literature was read and appropriated in the past, and how differently it was read from the ways in which we read it in the western traditions of the early twenty-first century.

Bibliography

- Adkin, N. (1992) "Hieronymus Ciceronianus: the *Catilinarians* in Jerome," *Latomus* 51: 408–420.
- Adkin, N. (1994a) "Juvenal and Jerome," *Classical Philology* 89: 69–72.
- Adkin, N. (1994b) "Terence's *Eunuchus* and Jerome," *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 137: 187–195.
- Adkin, N. (1997) "The Prologue of Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* and Jerome," *Hermes* 125: 240–241.
- Adkin, N. (2003) *Jerome on Virginity: A Commentary on the Libellus de virginitate servanda* (Letter 22). Leeds.
- Allen, D.C. (1970) *Mysteriously Meant: The Rediscovery of Pagan Symbolism and Allegorical Interpretation in the Renaissance*. Baltimore and London.
- Baron, H. (1966) *The Crisis of the Early Italian Renaissance: Civic Humanism and Republican Liberty in the Age of Classicism and Tyranny*. Princeton, NJ.
- Bawcutt, P. (1976) *Gavin Douglas: A Critical Study*. Edinburgh.
- Beal, J. (ed.) (2014) *Illuminating Moses: A History of Reception from Exodus to the Renaissance*. Leiden.
- Bernard, J.H. (ed.) (1911) *The Psalter in Latin and English*. London and Oxford.
- Brammall, S. (2015) *The English Aeneid: Translations of Virgil 1555–1646*. Edinburgh.
- Brinton, A.C. (ed.) (1930) *Maphaeus Vegius and his Thirteenth Book of the Aeneid*. Stanford.
- Brown, V. and Kallendorf, C. (1990) "Maffeo Vegio's Book XIII to Virgil's *Aeneid*: A Checklist of Manuscripts," *Scriptorium* 44: 107–126.
- Buckley, E. (2006) "Closure and Continuation in Maffeo Vegio's *Supplementum*," *Vergilius* 52: 108–137.
- Canitz, A.E.C. (1990) "The Prologue to the *Eneados*: Gavin Douglas's Directions for Reading," *Studies in Scottish Literature* 25: 1–22.
- Carletti, L. and Polacci, F. (2014) "Transition between Life and Afterlife: Analyzing the *Triumph of Death* in the Camposanto of Pisa," *Signs and Society* 2: S28–S120.
- Clayton, M. (2003) *The Cult of the Virgin Mary in Anglo-Saxon England*. Cambridge.
- Conte, G.B. (ed.) (2009) *P. Vergilius Maro Aeneis*. Berlin.
- Copeland, R. and Struck, P.T. (eds) (2016) *The Cambridge Companion to Allegory*. Cambridge.

- Cummings, R. (1995) "'To the cart the fift quheill': Gavin Douglas's Humanist Supplement to the 'Eneados,'" *Translation and Literature* 4: 133–156.
- Davies, W.D. and Allison, D.C. (1997) *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to Saint Matthew*, Vol. 3. Edinburgh.
- De Boer, C. (1938) *Ovide Moralisé*, Vol. 5. Amsterdam.
- Delany, S. (1972) *Chaucer's House of Fame: The Poetics of Skeptical Fideism*. Chicago and London.
- Di Cesare, M. (1984) "Cristoforo Landino: The Virgilian Commentator and Critic as Hero," in Pellegrini (1984), 19–31.
- Ebin, L. (1980) "The Role of the Narrator in the Prologues to Gavin Douglas's *Eneados*," *The Chaucer Review* 14: 353–365.
- Edgar, S. and Kinney, A.M. (eds) (2011) *The Vulgate Bible, Volume III: The Poetical Books*. Cambridge, MA.
- Fanning, M.W. (ed.) (1933) *Maphei Vegii Laudensis De Educatione Liberorum Et Eorum Claris Moribus Libri Sex*. Washington, DC.
- Farrell, J. and Putnam, M.C.J. (eds) (2010) *A Companion to Vergil's Aeneid and its Tradition*. Malden, MA.
- Foster, B. (2014) "'Types and Shadows': Uses of Moses in the Renaissance" in Beal (2014) 353–406.
- Fowler, D.P. (1989) "First Thoughts on Closure: Problems and Prospects," *Materiali e Discussioni [per l'...] 22: 75–122*.
- Goldschmidt, N. (2013) *Shaggy Crowns: Ennius' Annales and Virgil's Aeneid*. Oxford.
- Gray, D. (2001) "Gavin Douglas and 'the gret prynce Eneas,'" *Essays in Criticism* 51: 18–34.
- Hardie, P.R. (1986) *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford.
- Hardie, P.R. (1997) "Closure in Latin Epic" in Roberts, Dunn and Fowler (1997) 139–162.
- Henderson, J.G.W. (2000) "The Camillus Factory: *Per Ardeam ad Astra*," *Ramus* 29: 1–26.
- Hieatt, A.K. and Lorch, M. (1977) *Lorenzo Valla: On Pleasure*. New York.
- Hijmans, B.L. (1971–1972) "*Aeneia Virtus*: Vegio's Supplement to the *Aeneid*," *Classical Journal* 62: 144–155.
- Hinds, S. (1998) *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. Cambridge.
- Houghton, L.B.T. and Sgarbi, M. (eds) (forthcoming) *Virgil and Renaissance Culture*. Tempe, AZ.
- Kallendorf, C. (1989) *In Praise of Aeneas: Virgil and Epideictic Rhetoric in the Early Italian Renaissance*. Hanover, NH.
- Kallendorf, C. (1999) "Historicising the 'Harvard School': Pessimistic Readings of the *Aeneid* in the Italian Renaissance," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology* 99: 391–403.
- Kallendorf, C. (2007) *The Other Virgil: Pessimistic Readings of the Aeneid in Early Modern Culture*. Oxford.

- Kelly, J.N.D. (1975) *Jerome: His Life, Writings, and Controversies*. London.
- Kendal, G. (2011) *Gavin Douglas: The Aeneid (1513)*. London.
- Kraus, C.S., Marincola, J. and Pelling, C. (eds) (2010) *Ancient Historiography and Its Contexts: Studies in Honour of A.J. Woodman*. Oxford.
- Lally, S. (1987) *The Aeneid of Thomas Phaer and Thomas Twyne*. New York.
- Long, O.F. (1931) Review of Brinton (1930), *Classical Journal* 26: 547–551.
- Marincola, J. (2010) "Eros and Empire: Virgil and the Historians on Civil War" in Kraus, Marincola and Pelling (2010), 183–204.
- Mitchell-Boyask, R.N. (1996) "*sine fine*: Vergil's Masterplot," *American Journal of Philology* 117: 289–307.
- Morse, R. (1990) "Gavin Douglas: 'Off Eloquence the flowand balmy strand,'" in Morse and Windeatt (1990) 107–121.
- Morse, R. and Windeatt, B. (eds) (1990) *Chaucer Traditions: Studies in Honour of Derek Brewer*. Cambridge.
- O'Hara, J.J. (2010) "The Unfinished *Aeneid*?" in Farrell and Putnam (2010) 96–106.
- O'Sullivan, P. (2009) "Death *ante ora parentum* in Virgil's *Aeneid*," *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 139: 447–486.
- Patterson, A. (1987) *Pastoral and Ideology: Virgil to Valery*. Berkeley.
- Pellegrin, E. (1955) *La Bibliothèque des Visconti et des Sforza Ducs de Milan, au xv^e Siecle*. Paris.
- Pellegrini, A.L. (ed.) (1984) *The Early Renaissance: Virgil and the Classical Tradition*. Binghamton, NY.
- Pinti, D.J. (1993) "*Alter Maro, alter Mapheus*: Gavin Douglas's Negotiation of Authority in *Eneados* 13," *Journal of Medieval and Renaissance Studies* 23: 323–344.
- Plummer, A. (1901) *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Gospel According to S. Luke*. Edinburgh.
- Putnam, M.C.J. with Hankins, J. (ed.) (2004) *Maffeo Vegio: Short Epics*. Harvard.
- Roberts, D.H., Dunn, F.M. and Fowler, D.P. (eds) (1997) *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*. Princeton.
- Rogerson, A. (2013) "Vegio's Ascanius: Problems in the Continuation of the *Aeneid*," *Classical Receptions Journal* 5: 106–125.
- Rogerson, A. (forthcoming) "Re-evaluating Turnus: Multiple Voices in Vegio's *Supplement*," in Houghton and Sgarbi (forthcoming).
- Ross, C.S. (1981) "Maffeo Vegio's 'schort Cristyn wark,' with a Note on the Thirteenth Book in Early Editions of Vergil," *Modern Philology* 78: 215–226.
- Rubin, M. (2009) *Mother of God: A History of the Virgin Mary*. London.
- Schneider, B. (ed.) (1985) *Das Aeneissupplement des Maffeo Vegio*. Weinheim.
- Tanner, M. (1993) *The Last Descendant of Aeneas: The Hapsburgs and the Mythic Image of the Emperor*. New Haven and London.
- Thierry, J.J. (1963) "The Date of the Dream of Jerome," *Vigiliae Christianae* 17: 28–40.

- Tudeau-Clayton, M. (1998) "Supplementing the *Aeneid* in Early Modern England: Translation, Imitation, Commentary," *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 4: 507–525.
- Wilson-Okamura, D.S. (2010) *Virgil in the Renaissance*. Cambridge.
- Wingfield, E. (2014) *The Trojan Legend in Medieval Scottish Literature*. Cambridge.
- Zeeman, N. (2016) "Medieval religious allegory: French and English" in Copeland and Struck (2016), 148–161.

Ending the *Argonautica*: Giovanni Battista Pio's *Argonautica-Supplement* (1519)

Emma Buckley

Introduction: Ancient *Argonauticas*

The *Argonautica*—the tale of Jason, his quest for the Golden Fleece alongside a band of Argonaut brothers, and his capture of the Fleece with the help of the Colchian witch-maiden Medea—is a very old story indeed: Argo is already marked out in Homer's *Odyssey* as “well known to all” (πάσι μέλουσα, *Od.*12.70). Time and again authors of classical antiquity, both Greek and Roman, addressed the quest for the Fleece and its aftermath, in lyric (Pindar's fourth *Pythian*), elegy (Ovid's 12th *Heroides*), and of course tragedy, where Euripides' and Seneca's *Medeas* to this day dominate in modern receptions of the myth. The tale not just of the attainment of the Fleece, but also the adventures of the Argonauts along the way, was, however, tackled most fully in the Hellenistic *Argonautica* of Apollonius Rhodius (written in the first half of the third century BC). Apollonius' four-book epic—not only a narrative of marvellous adventures but also a treasure trove of aetiological, genealogical, ethnographical and scientific writing—sparked intense emulative response from Latin imitators, above all in the *Argonautica* of Varro Atacinus (now existing only in fragments), a late first-century BC translation of Apollonius that acculturated the Greek mythological epic to the contemporary nautical exploits of Julius Caesar.¹ But it would take the arrival of a new imperial dynasty, the Flavians, and another emperor famed for sea-faring exploits—Vespasian—for a Roman author to treat the myth of Argo once again in epic.

Valerius Flaccus' new Flavian *Argonautica*—written between 70 and 96 AD—was no mere translation of Apollonius. Melding the plot of Apollonius' Greek epic with a distinctly Roman and Virgilianizing treatment of subject matter, Valerius jettisoned the ostentatious erudition of the Apollonian piece to concentrate instead on the heroic nature of the quest and its “recuperated” hero, refiguring Jason as an Aeneas-style *dux* rather than Hellenistic “anti-hero”. Medea, too, becomes a distinctly Roman *virgo*—one who struggles with

1 On Apollonius, see esp. Hunter (1993a), Papanghelis & Rengakos (2001); on Varro's *Argonautica* see Braund (1993); Newman (2008) 319–321.

pudor and who displays a vulnerability absent in Apollonius' terrifying witch-maiden.² Indeed, in our last glimpse of Valerius' Medea—as the Argonauts urge Jason to abandon her on the island of Peuce after their marriage and in the face of a threatening Colchian fleet which has come to re-claim her—she bases her appeal to Jason not just on the supernatural help she has provided, but also on the distinctly Roman grounds of *pietas* (*Arg.* 8.415–444). Yet we never learn how Jason responds to this appeal, or indeed how Valerius intends to bring the *Argonautica* to a close. As Jason embarks on a stuttering reply—"Do you think I deserved something? Do you think I wanted such things to happen?" (*'mene aliquid meruisse putas, me talia velle?'* *Arg.* 8.467)—the text breaks off.

The Flavian *Argonautica* thus ends on a classic cliff-hanger, roughly mid-way through its eighth book.³ As Barbara Smith, the author of the first structural study on closure remarked, "the perception of closure is a function of the perception of structure"; and the question not just of structure but also structural *influence* has dominated modern speculation about the ending of Valerius' *Argonautica*.⁴ In an analysis which pitches the various specific possibilities offered by Apollonius (Valerius' *modello-esemplare*) against the generic example of Virgil (Valerius' *modello-codice*), Debra Hershkowitz concludes that whatever Valerius intended—a scheme of eight books, ten or twelve; a conclusion by duel between Absyrtus and Jason (following the Virgilian model of Turnus and Aeneas); or arrival in Thessaly (following Apollonius); or even an ending which encompasses the next stage of the myth, Medea's murder of Pelias—it is the very *incompleteness* of Valerius' epic that creates such richly diverse interpretative potential in the whole work.⁵

Ending the *Argonautica* (1): Maffeo Vegio's *Vellus Aureum*

Where current scholarship embraces Valerius' open-ended incompleteness, for supplementary-minded Renaissance scholars the *Argonautica* provided

2 On Valerius' *banalizzazione* of Apollonius, see Venini (1971), esp. 590–593, and further below. *The Companion to Valerius Flaccus* (2014) offers analysis and further bibliography on Valerius and Virgil, and the characterization of Jason and Medea. For Valerius' Romanized Medea, see also and especially Zissos (2012).

3 The consensus is that Valerius died before finishing the poem; see however Ehlers (1980), who believes the *Argonautica* was mostly complete, with part of the poem lost in transmission.

4 Smith (1968) 7. For closure in classical epic see Hardie (1997).

5 Hershkowitz (1998) 34. The influential distinction between 'example model' (*modello-esemplare*) and 'code-model' (*modello-codice*) comes from Conte (1984).

a different interpretative challenge. While continuators of Virgil's *Aeneid* or Lucan's *Bellum Civile* had a certain amount of creative licence in shaping their own endings, Valerius' imitators had—uniquely—the full story already, in Apollonius' Hellenistic epic, manuscripts of which had begun to arrive in Italy in the fifteenth century.⁶ Indeed, a full Apollonian *Argonautica* was available earlier than a Latin one, for the first manuscript of Valerius' *Argonautica*, discovered by Poggio Bracciolini in the monastery at St. Gallen, Switzerland, in 1416, contained only the first half of Valerius' poem (*Arg.* 1.1–4.317, with *Arg.* 1.393–442 and 2.240 missing). It was only in 1429 that a “complete” Valerian *Argonautica* was found and transcribed (by Niccolò Niccoli), and it was not until 1474 that the *editio princeps* was published, by Ugo Rugerius and Dominus Bertochus.⁷

A possible early example of a continuation of Valerius may be found in Maffeo Vegio's 1431 *Vellus Aureum*, a four book mini-epic in hexameters (roughly 1000 verses in total) which begins with the Argonauts already most of the way through their journey, about to arrive in Colchis (i.e. roughly where the St. Gallen MS (*Arg.* 1.1–4.317) breaks off).⁸ In a proem which begins by refusing to treat the early episodes of the Argonautic voyage (*VA.* 1.1–14), Vegio declares *Sola autem, quae sunt Colchorum in litore gesta, / expediam, raptum Phrixiae pellis honorem, / vesanos sequar Medae ardentis amores* (“I will recount only deeds done on the Colchian shore. I will pursue the stolen glory of Phrixus' fleece and the frenzied passion of enflamed Medea”, *VA.* 1.15–17).⁹ Vegio depicts Medea falling in love with Jason, his completion of the tasks set by Aeetes, and their escape from Colchis, before the epyllion climaxes with Medea's murder of her younger brother Absyrtus and Aeetes' curse upon his daughter, with a speech that brings the poem into touching distance with the Senecan *Medea*: “And in the end, after she has roamed sea and earth and sky as a fugitive, needy and despised, may she bring a bloody death upon herself!” (“*At demum maria et terras caelumque pererrans / exsul, egens, despecta, sua se caede cruentet!*”, *VA.* 4.246–247).

Could Vegio have seen the St. Gallen MS of Valerius' *Argonautica*, comprising only the first four books, and continued it? He was certainly no stranger to the art of supplementation, for his 1428 *Supplement* to the *Aeneid* was highly

6 See Schade & Eleuteri (2001) 41–48.

7 See Taylor-Briggs (2014); Zissos (2006) 173–174.

8 A modern edition with introduction and commentary is Gleis-Köhler (1998); see also Putnam (2004). For further bibliography on *Vellus Aureum* see Gleis-Köhler (1998) 16.

9 Text and translation of Vegio are from Putnam (2004).

popular throughout the Renaissance.¹⁰ And it is striking that Vegio draws upon Apollonius' *Argonautica* in an intense but extremely limited fashion when he lists the participants of the expedition: at just the place where there is a lacuna in the Poggio MS and all its *apographa* (*Arg.* 1.393–442: cf. *VA.* 1.36–65 with *AR Arg.* 1.23–233).¹¹ It is tempting, then, to consider Vegio's poem a continuation of Valerius. Yet the modern editors of *Vellus Aureum*, Reinhold F. Glei and Markus Köhler, are sceptical that these facts add up to the notion of conscious supplementarity. They find no trace of direct influence from Valerius Flaccus, instead analysing Vegio's poem as a conscious "Virgilianization" of Ovid's *Medea*.¹² Whether we wish to consider *Vellus Aureum* a "true" supplement or not, what is most striking about this early reception of the Argonautic myth is how limited Vegio's engagement with the poem fully furnished by Apollonius is. Vegio's Greek was simply not up to the task of committed, deep, engagement with Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*.¹³

Ending the *Argonautica* (2): Battista Pio's *Supplementum*

This problem would not apply to Valerius' next continuator, the Italian humanist Johannes Baptista Pius Bononiensis—or Giovanni Battista Pio (c. 1475–1546).¹⁴ Pio was a Valerius Flaccus enthusiast, and in 1519 he produced not only a critical edition and commentary on the *Argonautica* but also a life of the poet and hexameter verse supplement to Valerius' epic, which finished off book eight with a further 113 verses, and provided two further books over another 1300 lines (Book 9 (vv. 520); Book 10 (vv. 790)).¹⁵ Pio was not just interested in

10 For more on Vegio's life and works see Glei-Köhler (1998) 8–11; Putnam (2004); on the *Supplement*, see Rogerson in this volume.

11 See Glei-Köhler (1998) 21–27 for careful analysis of the catalogue.

12 This position is accepted by Kobusch (2004) 126–127; Zissos (2006) 173 n. 35. I have not been able to read Vignati (1959), who argues (p. 14) that Vegio's poem is a true supplement (cf. Glei-Köhler (1998) 20 n. 17). Ehlers (2001) suggests that *Vellus Aureum* may have been written as a deliberate *alternative* to Valerius' epic, written to re-establish a "properly" Virgilian rendering of the story.

13 Before the Latin interlinear translation of Andronico Callisto (around 1475), further reception of Apollonius can only be found in the three books of Basinio da Parma, begun in 1455 and left unfinished at his death in 1457: see Ferri (1920); Resta (1981); Glei-Köhler (1998) 22.

14 Sometimes also known as Giambattista Pio/Giovanni Battista Pio. On Pio's life and works see most comprehensively Kobusch (2004) 19–101.

15 *C. Valerii Flacci commentarii Pio Bononiensi auctore cum codicis poetae emendatione ex antiquo exemplari dacico additis libris tribus, qui desiderabantur, et Orpheo Latino*, Bonon-

Valerius, an “on-trend” author whose quality was rated rather more highly in the Renaissance than much of the twentieth century.¹⁶ A student of Filippo Beroaldo (the founder of the rhetorical school of “Apuleianism” and Professor of Rhetoric at Bologna (1474–1505)), Pio would succeed to his Chair, producing the first Renaissance commentary on Lucretius (1511), and editing, among others, Fulgentius, Sidonius Apollinaris and Plautus. Moreover, Pio, in the vanguard of Renaissance engagement with Greek classical works, produced Latin translations of Greek epigrams by various authors including Sappho, Moschus, and Apollonius’ contemporary Callimachus.¹⁷ Pio was, then, peculiarly well suited not only to elucidate the artificial and mannered Latin of Valerius in his commentary, but also able confidently to supplement the gaps in Valerius’ *Argonautica* with the Hellenistic epic of Apollonius.

As we have already seen, however, modern scholars have stressed how very different the Flavian *Argonautica* is to Apollonius’ epic, stylistically, thematically and ideologically. A continuation that simply “completes” Valerius with a translation of Apollonius—drawing upon Apollonius’ *quid* with no attention to Valerius’ *quale*—could hardly be counted as a compelling continuation. And at first glance, it does seem as if Pio’s *Supplement*—with its stated aim to complete the *Argonautica* “on the basis of Apollonius Rhodius”¹⁸—is rather deaf to that difference. Where Valerius excises Apollonius’ erudite digressions and aetiological focus, Pio maintains them.¹⁹ Where Valerius has significantly altered characterization, for example by making his Hercules a culture-hero, a saviour figure whose actions materially advance civilisation, Pio returns to Apollonius’ depiction of a savage, almost bestial figure (*Supp.* 10.462–481). And most egregiously, where Valerius has outright altered events—for example by killing off the Argonaut Canthus in the war in Colchis (*Arg.* 6.317–370) or replacing the helmsman Tiphys with the Argonaut Erginus (*Arg.* 5.65–70)—Pio fails to react

iae 1519—henceforth Pio (1519). On Pio’s life of Valerius see Rieker (1998) 358–359; Kobusch (2004) 164–167; on his critical edition of Valerius, see Kobusch (2004) 144–181.

16 On Valerius’ popularity in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries see Rieker (1998) 357–358; Zissos (2006) 173–178.

17 See Kobusch (2004) 114–115. Pio frequently translates Apollonius into Latin prose in his commentary on Valerius: see Kobusch (2004) 162–163.

18 *Octauī Libri Argonauticon Reliquum ex Apollonio Rhodio: Interprete Pio Bononiensi, cum duobus Aliis Libris Subsequentibus Ex Eodem Rhodio, unde habet perfecta historia argonautica*, Pio (1519) CLXIII.

19 Cf. e.g. *Supp.* 9.44–55 and 10.231–243 on the settlements established by the Colchians chasing the Argonauts; *Supp.* 9.183–192, 10.634–635, 10.700–734 on customs and names resulting from Argo’s passage.

to such alterations in his own continuation. Canthus must die again according to the Apollonian model (*Supp.* 10.503–520; cf. *AR Arg.* 4.1485–1501), and in Pio's *Supplement*, it is Ancaeus who somehow has been given the job of steering Argo once more (*Supp.* 10.282–295; *AR Arg.* 4.1259–1276).²⁰

It is no wonder, then, that Pio's continuation has been deemed "a work of uncertain artistic merit", praised only on the occasions on which it manages to shake off the oppressive mantle of Apollonian influence. Indeed, Pio's most recent critic, Andrew Zissos, sees in Pio's project a fundamentally insoluble tension between translation of Apollonius and continuation of Valerius, one in which the continuator shows only "intermittent moments of alertness" to his role as continuator.²¹ Yet I will argue that Pio is both well aware of the divergent impulses and preoccupations of the two authors he emulates, and closely attentive to the precepts of sixteenth-century translation theory, which demanded not just precision in comprehension but also rigour and creativity in expression, requiring that the translator "transform" himself to identify fully with the source text.²² Indeed, in the introduction and commentary to the *Supplement* written by Pio's son, Giulio Cesare Pio, the younger Pio explicitly articulates the differences in style between Valerius and Apollonius as poets, talks of the constant effort the continuator has to make to resist the "seduction" of the Apollonian model, and (drawing upon the ancient translation-theorist Horace) speaks of the "negligent diligence" of the listless *metaphrastes* who merely translates word-for-word.²³

Given the evidence above of Pio's "mistakes", we may conclude that the continuator in the end fails to resist the gravitational pull of the Hellenistic epic. Nevertheless, I will argue—in particular, in the characterization of Jason and

20 For these and other slips see Kobusch (2004) 632; Zissos (2014) 362–364.

21 Zissos (2006) 174; he records further negative reaction from Caussin de Perceval (1829) ix–x. Zissos (2014) does however provide a more positive assessment of Pio's *Supplement*, and the commentary of Kobusch (2004), focusing on *translatio*, *imitatio* and *aemulatio*, offers excellent analysis of Pio's use of Apollonius and Valerius.

22 See esp. Bruni's (c. 1426) *De Interpretatione Recta*, in Robinson (1997) 57–60. Pio has already used similar language in his edition of Valerius, where he asserts that he is bringing that author back to life through his labours (*nunc labore nostro redivivus Flaccus*): see Kobusch (2004) 146.

23 Cf. Pio (1519) Introduction CLXIII, esp. *Tertium ... quod verbum verbo reddere non possumus. Esset enim ἄφθυμότερον et absurdum: et ut proprie loquar, diligentia negligens* ("In the third place ... we cannot render word for word. To do that would both lazy and absurd, and to put it more appropriately, the work of one careless in his diligence.") Cf. Horace, *nec verbo verbum curabis reddere fidus / interpres* ("Nor be concerned to render word for word, a slavish translator", *Ars Poetica* 133–134).

Medea, and in the creation of a strikingly gloomy Valerian *Weltanschauung*—that Pio shows a genuinely sophisticated understanding of the nature of Valerius' epic that can be seen throughout the *Supplement*. In creating this synthesis of Greek and Roman, moreover, he is not just providing a continuation that is "Valerian" in spirit, but is also offering a creative transfiguration of his own scholarly edition of Valerius. For one of the great achievements of Pio's commentary on Valerius, reflected in the *Supplement* itself, is the systematic tracking of the influence of Apollonius. Elucidating creatively just how closely Valerius' *Argonautica* had already responded to Apollonius' Hellenistic epic, Pio's continuation invites us to examine anew Valerius' debt to his Greek predecessor, redressing the balance of a modern critical focus which has hitherto largely neglected the Greek past of Valerius' Flavian epic.²⁴ Pio, in other words, embraces the role of *interpres* not only in his role as critic and commentator of Valerius but also in his role as continuator.²⁵

Ending the *Argonautica*

Pio's intention to create a seamless transition from Valerian *Argonautica* to *Supplement* that is at the same time rooted in Apollonius' epic is signalled from the outset: first, in a declaration that Pio will supplement the *Argonautica* "on the basis of Apollonius and according to his own interpretation", and then in an audacious rearrangement of Valerius' own text. Concluding Valerius' *Argonautica* at *Arg.* 8.466, the edition declares "FINIS".²⁶ Pio then offers the *last* line of Valerius' epic as the *first* of his own *Supplement*, before allowing Jason to continue in a speech closely based on *AR Arg.* 4.395–409 (which attempts to appease Medea's anger, points out the extreme peril of their situation, and promises that if Absyrtus and Aeetes are intent upon Medea's death, he will fight):²⁷

24 On Valerius' edition see Kobusch (2004) 144–180. The only full-length study of Apollonius and Valerius is Harmand (1898); Venini (1971) and Bessone (1991) are influential examples of the tendency to stress the differences between the two authors. See now also the essays in Augoustakis (2014).

25 Cf. *ex Apollonio Rhodio: Interprete Pio Bononiensi ...* Pio (1519) CLXIII. On the significance of Pio's self-entitled role as *interpres*—also the name he gives himself in his task as editor of Valerius' *Argonautica*—see Kobusch (2004) 144–146.

26 Later editions do not use this conceit: see Kobusch (2004) 323.

27 In the passages which follow I use the text of Kobusch and provide my own translations. For Apollonius, the edition is Fränkel (1970); translations are from Hunter (1993b).

“Me ne aliquid meruisse putas? Me talia velle? (Arg. 8.467)
Diva viro nimium coniunx infensa fideli.
Horreo si qua movent animos: ingrataque nobis
quae te cumque premunt. Sed mollia tempora primum
captamus, saevique placet mora commoda belli.
Tot coiere duces hostileque impete turmae
certatim incubuere odiis mortemque minantur.
Causa fuga est et noster amor.”
Supp. 8.458–474

“Do you think I deserved something? Do you think I wanted such things to happen? My divine wife is too harsh to her faithful husband. I tremble if anything makes you angry, if any ingratitude on my part oppresses you. But we are seeking the favourable time, and I am resolved upon an appropriate delay to savage war. So many leaders have gathered, and with hostile onslaught the cavalry troops have settled around us, emulous in their hatred: and they threaten death. The cause is your flight and our love.”

Compare the closely corresponding response from Jason in the Hellenistic *Argonautica*:

“Ἰσχεο, δαιμονίη· τὰ μὲν ἀνδάνει οὐδ’ ἐμοὶ αὐτῷ,
 ἀλλὰ τιν’ ἀμβολίην διζήμεθα δημοτήτος,
 ὅσπον δυσμενέων ἀνδρῶν νέφος ἀμφιδέδην
 εἵνεκα σεῦ.”
 AR, *Arg.* 4.395–398

“Calm down, poor lady. I too take no pleasure in this, but we are looking for some way to put off the battle, so large is the horde of the enemy blazing around us because of you ...”

Pio’s work is clearly a close, if heightened, translation of Apollonius: indeed *Diva* directly translates Jason’s opening address, δαιμονίη.²⁸ Yet there are some crucial differences too: in Valerius, Medea is *already* married, as Pio’s Jason stresses when he calls on Medea as wife and himself as husband (*Diva viro ... coniunx*; cf. *Arg.* 8.415, 419). And while Apollonius’ Jason is quick to make

28 As Kobusch (2004), whose commentary is very helpful throughout, notes.

Medea the object of blame—they are surrounded “because of you” as he rather gracelessly puts it—Pio’s Jason, who has already foregrounded his continuing fidelity (*viro ... fideli*), declares their predicament comes not just from Medea’s flight but also their joint love (*noster amor*).²⁹ Finally, Pio offers a crucial twist on the plan that Apollonius’ Jason had put forward to thwart the Colchians. While the Greek Jason comes up with a plan to feign alliance with the Colchians in order to slay Absyrtus, committing to fight the Colchians only after their leader is taken from them by trickery (AR *Arg.* 4.404–409), Pio’s Jason has no such devious proposal. If Absyrtus and Aeetes are bent upon Medea’s death, this much more martial Jason declares he will take the Colchians on in a fair fight (“*iusta in adversos committam proelia Colchos*,” *Supp.* 8.489). The scheming diplomat of Apollonius’ epic has yielded to Valerius’ characterization of Jason as confident, battle-hardened *dux*.³⁰

Pio shows an equally acute understanding of Medea’s characterization. Here is her opening response in full:

*Sic ait. Illa gravi ductorem affata dolore est:
 “Num venti mea vota simul tua verba tulerunt
 Aesonide ac pariter curas pepulere priores?
 Tempora causarum subitque pericula belli,
 postquam in deterius lapsa est fortunae Cytaeae
 coniugis et noster non est reparabilis error?
 Nunc Martem differre libet, nunc Colchida bella
 post conubia pacta exspectatosque Hymenaeos.
 Tu tantum confide mihi, placabo furentem
 germanum et blandis componam proelia dictis
 legatos donis mulcens atque effera corda.”*

Supp. 8.490–500

So Jason spoke. She addressed the leader in deep grief: “Have the winds then carried away my prayers and your promises alike, Jason, and likewise have they dispelled your former love for me? And do you plead as an excuse the inconvenient time and the danger of sudden war, *after* your Colchian wife’s luck has begun to run out, and our mistake cannot be undone? Now it pleases you to postpone battle, now to postpone Colchian

29 See Rieker (1998) 361; cf. Kobusch (2004) 325.

30 For a rich close reading of the Absyrtus-murder which explores further the rehabilitation of Jason as figure of martial *virtus* see Zissos (2014) 368–374. See too Kobusch (2004) 311–314, 637–638.

wars—*after* you've made the marriage-contract and hoped-for wedding. Just you trust me: I will placate my raging brother, and I will settle war with sweet words, appeasing the envoys and their savage hearts with gifts."

Once again, Pio's close adherence to the Apollonian text is clear, particularly in the final lines of the speech, which make reference to negotiation with Colchian envoys who simply do not feature in Valerius' *Argonautica*. Reminiscent too of Apollonius is Medea's lament that Jason has forgotten his promises (cf. AR *Arg.* 4.355–359, esp. 358–359). But even so, this is hardly the οὐλοῶς μῦθος—or "deadly reply"—of Apollonius' Medea, who has already struggled to contain her "grim anger" and desire to destroy everything, including herself, in consuming flames (AR *Arg.* 4.390–393; her plan to kill Absyrtus follows at AR *Arg.* 4.410–420). Rather, Pio's Medea speaks here not as the supernaturally powerful witch but as the abandoned lover: like Virgil's Dido, as the younger Pio points out in his commentary; or as the Dido of Ovid's *Heroides*.³¹ Behind this abandoned heroine of course stands Catullus' Ariadne, who had already upbraided Theseus with the words

*"at non haec quondam blanda promissa dedisti
voce mihi, non haec miserae sperare iubebas,
sed conubia laeta, sed optatos hymenaeos,
quae cuncta aereii discerpunt irrita venti."*

Cat. 64.139–142

"These were not the promises you once gave me with coaxing voice, nor did you order me to hope for this in my wretchedness, but for happy marriage, for a hoped-for wedding. The winds of the air scatter all these empty promises."

Here, then, Pio's Medea is recast as an abandoned heroine of Roman epic and elegy, an Ariadne or a Dido, in a way that clearly reprises Valerius' own intertextual strategy in the *Argonautica*.³² It is only fitting, then, that when Medea and

31 Pio (1519) CLXIII (referring to *Aen.* 4.316) *per conubia nostra, per inceptos hymenaeos*; cf. Rieker (1998) 362. For Ovid, *Her.* 7.8 (*atque idem venti vela fidemque ferent*) cf. Kobusch (2004) 391.

32 On Medea and Dido see Hull (1975); Fucecchi (1997); for the influence of other mythological heroines, Stover (2011). Kobusch (2004) 331 notes also the intertextual influence of Ovid's Scylla (*Met.* 8.1–151, esp. 134–135) on Pio here and 427 (*ad Supp.* 9.265) of Ovid's Byblis (*Met.* 9.515).

Jason get their second wedding, closely written to the Apollonian model, and reprising the attendance of flower-gathering nymphs, Argonaut guards, and Orpheus playing the wedding hymn (*Supp.* 10.158–181; cf. *AR Arg.* 4.1141–1160), Pio adds a significant new guest—the *pronuba* Juno, goddess of marriage—and precisely the signs accompanying Dido's doomed wedding (*Supp.* 10.175–176; cf. *Aen.* 4.166 f.).

Even Dido—Valerius' major model for Medea—is, however, only ever a partial model for a heroine capable of a much more destructive response to love, and Pio's decision to have his Medea classify their love as *noster non reparable error* is especially acute. Its sense encompasses the Apollonian original, where Medea laments her “mistake” (ἐπεὶ τὸ πρῶτον ἀάσθην / ἀμπλακίη, *AR Arg.* 4.413–414) even as she makes her deadly reply; and of course to use *error* as synonym for “love” is well established in the lexicon of Roman elegy. Yet it is also the word Medea applies to herself when she first succumbs to love and makes the decision to help Jason in the *Argonautica* proper: “At last, having dared to speak in the midst of her grief she spoke: ‘By what misfortune, with what *error* am I willingly drawn away, to be thus wakeful?’” (*tandemque fateri / ausa sibi †paulum† medio sic fata dolore est: / “nunc ego quo casu vel quo sic per(vi)gil usque / ipsa volens errore trahor?”*, *Arg.* 7.7–8; cf. *Supp.* 8.490). Pio's phrase also re-echoes the exact moment at which Medea puts this decision into effect, as she casts her spells upon Jason to aid him in the tasks set by her father and embraces wrong-doing:

*Inde ubi facta nocens et non revocabilis umquam
cessit ab ore pudor propriorque implevit Erinys ...*

Arg. 7.461–462

As a result she was made guilty and her *pudor*, never to be recalled, receded from her face, and the Erinys, closer now, possessed her ...

In this first speech from Medea in the *Supplement*, then, Pio astutely re-engages the crucial conditions of the Valerian Medea's first submission to infatuation. And in the apostrophe which follows—an interventionist tactic used much more often by Apollonius than Valerius—Pio skilfully invests the source text once again with the kind of infuriate love which has dominated throughout the Flavian *Argonautica*:³³

33 Barich (1982) 11–12; Kobusch (2004) 311.

Σχέτλι' Ἔρωσ, μέγα πῆμα, μέγα στύγος ἀνθρώποισιν,
 ἐκ σέθεν οὐλόμεναί τ' ἔριδες στοναχαί τε γόοι τε,
 ἄλγεά τ' ἄλλ' ἐπὶ τοῖσιν ἀπείρονα τετρήχασιν·
 δυσμενέων ἐπὶ παισὶ κορύσσειο δαῖμον ἀερθεῖς
 οἷος Μηδεΐη στρυγερὴν φρεσὶν ἔμβαλες ἄτην.

AR, *Arg.* 4.445–449

Reckless Eros, great curse, greatly loathed by men, from you come deadly strifes and grieving and troubles, and countless other pains on top of these swirl up. Rear up, divine spirit, against my enemies' children as you were when you threw hateful folly into Medea's heart.

*Improbe Amor, quantis mortalia pectora curis
 involvis miscens odium funebria bella
 et gemitus fletusque graves! Discordia demens
 et manibus Rabies pectus laniata cruentis
 funerea vadunt fraterna per agmina dextra.
 Innumeris agitas discordem caedibus orbem
 aspera cuncta viris fecundo pectore promens.
 Elatus deus arcitenens facibusque timendus,
 quali Medae complesti corda veneno
 oblatae fratris, patriae oblataeque parentum!*

Supp. 8.531–540

Reckless Amor, with what great cares you swamp mortal hearts, mixing hatred, deadly wars, and groans and heavy weeping! Mad Discordia and Rabies—scored across the chest with bloody hands—pace amongst the fraternal battle-lines with death-dealing hand. You agitate the discordant world with countless slaughter, furnishing from your fecund breast all things calamitous to mankind. Lofty arrow-bearing god, a fearful figure with your torches, with what poison did you fill the heart of Medea, forgetful of brother, fatherland and parents!

Pio's *improbis Amor* is of course not just direct translation of Apollonius but also literary reminiscence of the *improbis Amor* which destroyed Virgil's Dido (*improbe Amor, quid non mortalia pectora cogis!*, *Aen.* 4.412). But there is something again distinctly Valerian about Amor's effects here, for Discordia and Rabies were last unleashed at Lemnos (*Arg.* 2.204, 206) in a "civil war" instigated by an infuriate Venus between wives and husbands, and that complex of imagery pointedly informs the fraternal blood of Absyrtus which is about to

be spilled by Medea and Jason. And while Pio refuses to import the far from Christian imprecation with which Apollonius' narrator ends, his alternative—to picture a Medea forgetful of brother, father and fatherland—is once again closely attuned to Medea's experiences in Valerius' *Argonautica*, recalling as they do the day of her wedding, at which "harmonious" (*unanimis*) Venus and Amor attended (*Arg.* 8.232), and Medea celebrated the day "forgetful of her woes" (*oblita malorum*, *Arg.* 8.238).³⁴

Pio's consistent depiction of Medea throughout the *Supplement* as a woman in thrall to *error* and *Erinyes* shows a commitment to Valerius' characterization of a heroic *virgo* persecuted by the gods and deserving of more pity than the calculating, brooding and unsettling Medea of Apollonius' fourth book. Indeed, when Arete does help Medea with persuasive words to her husband Alcinous, she goes far beyond Apollonius' Queen, who terms Medea's actions foolish behaviour ("she made a mistake" (ἁλάσθη, *AR Arg.* 4.1080)). Instead, Pio's Arete recasts Medea as a *pia virgo* standing up to the tyranny of her father (*Supp.* 10.96–97) and calls upon her husband, as a just king, to favour the pious—"Ergo pios, rex iuste, fove!" (*Supp.* 10.101). In fact, this Arete goes even further, introducing Medea as a woman who in giving aid to the Greeks has distinguished herself in pious daring:

"O dulcis coniunx, oppressam Aetida curis
exime, quae Minyas fovit cognataque Graii
arma ducis facilemque piis se praebuit ausis ..."

Supp. 10.86–88

"Dear husband, lighten the load of Medea's cares, she who aided the Minyae and the kinsmen allies of the Greek leader, and showed herself apt in deeds of pious daring ..."

Arete here reaches beyond the example set by Medea herself in the *Argonautica* to frame her as the most outstanding female example of virtue in Valerius' *Argonautica*—Hypsipyle, the glory of her fatherland and, famously saviour of her father, whose deeds of great daring Valerius himself applauds (*ingentibus*

34 See Schimann (1997), who sees in the Lemnos episode the key to the entire Medea-love narrative. Hardie (1993) 43–44 shows how indebted the Valerian episode already is to Virgil's Dido-narrative. For further play on the Erinyes-motif from Pio see esp. *Supp.* 9.265–267, contrasting *AR Arg.* 4.739; and for error/Erinyes, *Supp.* 10.26–29, 31–32 versus *AR Arg.* 4.1011–1019.

ausis, *Arg.* 2.242).³⁵ By such means, Pio does not just continue to characterize his Medea as *pia virgo*, resisting Apollonius' character development to the very end: he also displays a genuinely sophisticated understanding of the means by which Valerius articulates the nature of *amor* and its effect on Medea, drawing upon the same intertextual and intratextual strategies already used by the Flavian epic.

Pio's Neo-Latin *Argonautica*

We have seen, then, how Pio adheres to "Valerian" characterization even when offering close translation of Apollonius. But it is not just in character-study that Pio resists the gravitational pull of the Hellenistic epic. Pio also imports the gloomily oppressive world of Valerius' *Argonautica*, whose preoccupation with dissimulative tyrants, the incursion of "Romanizing" civil war, and the corruption of power has long been noted.³⁶ Of course, treachery abounds in the Hellenistic *Argonautica* too—the death of Absyrtus is a clear case in point—but right from the beginning of the *Supplement* Pio intensifies the atmosphere of deceit. In Apollonius' *Argonautica*, when Absyrtus goes to his death, he is emphatically deceived (αἰνотάττησιν ὑποσχέσῃσι δολωθεῖς, *AR Arg.* 4.456): but in Pio's continuation, Absyrtus is not only deceived, but is also a deceiver (*fallax*) as he goes to parley with his sister Medea (*Supp.* 8.551).³⁷ The whole atmosphere, in fact, is treacherous—as the narrator puts it, "Firm faith is to be found nowhere!" (*Nusquam tuta fides!*, *Supp.* 8.545)—and throughout the *Supplement* the savagery of Aeetes and the Colchians is emphatically stressed.

We have already seen Queen Arete stress, for example, in opposition to the just rule of her own husband Alcinous, the tyranny of the grim, enraged and iniquitous Aeetes (*Supp.* 10.86–111): an emphasis on good governance versus

35 Note too Medea's final act in the *Supplement*, the murder of the bronze giant Talos from afar with magic. In Apollonius' account Medea's evil mind-set and "grim power" is foregrounded (cf. esp. *AR Arg.* 4.1676–1677). But Pio's Medea speaks piously (*pia sermone*, *Supp.* 10.669–670), motivated, as the commentary glosses, by compassion and the desire to lighten the Argonauts' woes: Pio (1519) CLXXXVII.

36 See Bernstein (2014) with further bibliography.

37 Cf. the commentary ad. *Supp.* 8.548–550: *Heros: Iason: quem honesto nomine vocat non ob amorem aut reverentiam: sed ut tegetet insidias* ("Heros: Jason. He calls him by this true name, not on account of love or respect, but in order to conceal his deceitful plans", Pio (1519) CLXV). Medea too is *fallax* (*Supp.* 8.518). On Absyrtus, cf. Zissos (2014) 371 n. 30. Kobusch (2004) 353.

bad, not to be found in Apollonius' text, where the Hellenistic Arete, in a display of *realpolitik*, merely notes that while the Greeks are allies, Aeetes is an unknown quantity who lives far away (AR *Arg.* 4.1074–1076). And at the very outset of the *Supplement*, too, we have seen Jason take the same tactic, simultaneously re-echoing the tyranny of Pelias which motivated the quest in *Argonautica* 1 (*aspera iussa*, *Supp.* 8.475; cf. *Arg.* 1.200), and intensifying Medea's terror with a vividly realized picture of Medea's future humiliation at the hands of the Colchians, led in sordid triumph beneath the savage gaze of family and amid the hostile muttering of the mob (*Supp.* 8.474–483).³⁸ This extensive speech goes far beyond the understated speculation of the Apollonian source: “ὁ τοι καὶ ῥίγιον ἄλγος / ἔσσεται, εἴ σε θανόντες ἔλωρ κείνοισι λίποιμεν” (“If we join battle, we will all perish in hateful death, and the pain will be even worse for you if our deaths leave you an easy prey for them”, AR *Arg.* 4.402–403). Here too Jason makes the case for just versus unjust governance, as he declares he will fight “just wars” (*iusta proelia*) if the mad arrogance (*vesana superbia*) of Absyrtus and the savage (*efferus*) Aeetes insist on war (*Supp.* 8.484–489).³⁹

Such a vision of worldly power—often articulated in displays of verbal art and artifice which exceed the more measured strategies of persuasion that we find in both Apollonius and Valerius—may not simply reconstruct a jaded Valerian *Weltanschauung*, but also reflect upon Bologna's troubled present.⁴⁰ Indeed, Beate Kobusch sees in Pio's Jason not simply the attempt to follow Valerius' Aeneas-style characterization, but also to create the model of a new kind of Renaissance hero. Yet if Pio's Jason is motivated by a modern notion of justice, this makes his murder of Absyrtus all the more difficult to contemplate, and Pio does not shy away from much more overt critique of his character

38 For further “Valerian” language of tyranny see esp. *Supp.* 9.212 with *Arg.* 7.579, 8.60; *Supp.* 9.213–214 with *Arg.* 5.659.

39 Note, for example, in Jason's speech alone striking hyperbaton (e.g. *Supp.* 8.468), bold alliteration (*mortemque minantur*, 473), and the clever use of metre, the double elision of 473 reflecting the frenzy of the forces closing in, while Arete opts for emotive questions and exclamation (*Supp.* 10.91, 101, 110), deploys argument not only *ab utili* (as Apollonius') but also *ab honesto* (92–97) and *ab impossibili* (101–102), and offers a barrage of antithesis contrasting the *pia virgo* with her *iniquus pater*. For further on Pio's lexical, stylistic and metrical choices see Kobusch (2004) 600–626. On Valerius' mannered style see Barich (2014) esp. 33–35 with bibliography; on Apollonius' style, which shows much less interest in rhetorically charged speech-making, see Toohey (1994); more generally, Hunter (2001).

40 See Kobusch (2004) 60, 71–72, noting that Pio lived through the events which provided much material for Machiavelli's *Il Principe*: Pio himself authored a short poem *De Pace* (1503) and a longer six-book epic on the history of Bologna in 1510. For further contemporary resonances see Kobusch (2004) 345 n. 1009; also 380–381, 393, 415, 497.

than the ancient texts allow. While we have seen Pio work to lessen Jason's responsibility for the plan to kill Absyrtus (indeed Pio skirts the issue of an explicitly articulated plan for murder from Medea too), when it comes to the actual slaughter he applies the epithet *saevus tyrannus* to Jason *himself*, a pejorative term we have not seen in Valerius' *Argonautica* (albeit focalized through the experience of Absyrtus (*Supp.* 8.562–563)).⁴¹ The same loaded word has also been applied earlier to Jason, as the recipient of the gift of Thoas' cloak (a symbol of a previous desertion, since it was given by Hypsipyle “to the Greek tyrant” on his departure from Lemnos (*Argolico ... tyranno*, *Supp.* 8.511)).

Indeed, in an innovative coda to the murder of Absyrtus, we may see Pio offering his own solution to this most problematic act committed by the heroic *vir* and *pia virgo* so obviously otherwise recognizable as Valerius' characters. After the pair have committed the murder, and Medea seeks absolution from Circe, the nymph explicitly condemns the shamefulness of love itself in compelling her to crime in words that transform the speech of Apollonius' Circe, who merely laments Medea's “shameful journey” (*AR Arg.* 4.739): “*Sic cogit amor, sic incitat ira. / Pro miseram, qui turpis amor! Quae tristis Erinys / impulit in facinus tantum!*” (“So love compels, so anger incites. Ah, you wretch, how shameful love is! Which dreadful Erinys has driven you to such a crime!”, *Supp.* 9.265–267). This condemnation of love is accompanied by a genuine act of love from Jason, which—as the continuation's commentary points out—is entirely invented by Pio:⁴²

*Illā gravi iam dudum oppressa dolore
desiccat levi rorantia lumina peplo,
donec Iolchiacus deflentem sustulit heros
et—iuvenem comitatus Amor—suadere salutem
incipiunt blandoque levant sermone gementem.*

Supp. 9.276–280

Medea, so long now burdened by weighty pain, dries her tearful eyes on her fine robe, while the Iolchian hero gathered her up in his arms as she wept, and—Amor accompanying the young man—they begin to urge her to cheer up and lighten her groans with coaxing words.

41 Cf. Zissos (2014) 371, who reads this moment as the nadir of Jason's characterization in the *Supplement*, a low-point from which the hero will re-attain heroic status.

42 Pio (1519) CLXXI.

In this act of consolation, Pio recalls the Jason of Valerius' *Argonautica*, who had comforted his lover before (*Arg.* 7.412, *solatus amantem* [est]). But this moment also reverses the roles played by Jason and Medea herself before the murder of Absyrtus, when Medea comforted her "sad lover" Jason (*Phasias his maestum solatur amantem*, *Supp.* 8.502) and forced him to undertake the treacherous murder of Absyrtus (*Supp.* 8.501–504). Pio's reading of the murder, in other words, suggests that it is not only Medea in this *Supplement* who is subject to the compulsion of the *Erinys*: Jason too suffers from a love which forces him in turn into the role of *tyrannus*. This moralizing approach to the consequences of love—its depiction as a mutually damaging *error* now felt as much by Jason as Medea—constitutes a significant turn away from the preoccupations of the ancient *Argonauticas*, but sits well in the scholarly context of a sixteenth-century interpretation of the motivations and costs of love.⁴³

As much as Pio's *Supplement* positions itself as the "completion" of Valerius on the basis of Apollonius, then, it is also a document entirely of its time in its rhetoricity, its moralizing approach, and its interest in the depiction of power more broadly. Even Pio's interest in the aetiological and scientific—which clearly does not emulate Valerius—is inspired as much by the encyclopaedic interests and polymathic ambitions of neo-Latin scholarship more generally than it is by slavish adherence to Apollonius.⁴⁴ But above all, Pio moves furthest from his source when it comes to the simile. Beate Kobusch notes that Pio has already recognized and adopted Valerius' general strategy when it comes to the Apollonian simile, using this figure as an opportunity to advance his own interests (often, the exploration of a character's psychological interiority in more depth).⁴⁵ And as Valerius often re-tunes a simile to the contemporary concerns of first-century AD Rome, Pio most explicitly brings the mythological world of the *Argonautica* into touch with sixteenth-century Bolognese life here.

43 Note, e.g. Pio's own comments ad *Arg.* 6.473, (remarking on the special susceptibility of women to love); and his notes ad *Arg.* 7.8 and *Arg.* 8.162 which draw on Plautus' and Horace's depiction of the misery of love. For a reading that stresses Pio's moralizing depiction of heroism more generally in the *Supplement*, in line with contemporary ethical thought, see Kobusch (2004) 379, 635–641.

44 See Kobusch (2004) 628.

45 "Often Pio wanders and leaves behind the author, in order to as it were clothe and adorn the poetic work with flowery detours" (*Vagatur saepe Pius et auctorem relinquit: ut floridis diuerticalis poeticum opus uelut uestiat: ac exornet*, Pio (1519) CLXIII). On Pio's similes see Kobusch (2004) 631.

The most strikingly original incursion of the modern is in the simile which in Apollonius' text compares the swift motion of Argo, propelled by Nereids through the Planktai, to a game of catch played by young girls (AR *Arg.* 4.948–955). In Pio's version the point of comparison is now a strapping youth of Bologna, who competes with his young companions and at the same time conditions his body while playing the game (*Supp.* 9.474–485). This version—motivated not just by a spirit of literary emulation but also by *pietas patriae*, as the commentary notes—allows Pio a brief moment of praise for his city.⁴⁶ Less developed, but perhaps even more arresting, is Pio's attempt to bring alive the fear felt by the Argonauts as they are trapped in the sandy wasteland of the Syrtes after a nine day storm, and are convinced that they are going to die. Apollonius' simile uses the aimless roaming of the Argonauts as the centre-point of comparison, figuring them as men wandering a city "like lifeless ghosts, awaiting the destruction of war or plague or a terrible storm," and accompanied by horrific portents, cult statues sweating blood, and untimely darkness at noon (AR *Arg.* 4.1278–1287).

Pio chooses instead a multi-layered simile, which encompasses the soon-to-die plague victim, a countryman unsettled by storm, and the supernatural phenomena of Apollonius' text (*Supp.* 10.301–314). Yet he focuses, at the beginning, entirely on the fear felt by the sailors, in a simile which expresses their emotion not just through the excitement of a young soldier new to battle, but also the pity for him felt by his more experienced comrades:

*Non secus ima pavor crebro praecordia pulsu
haurit, anhelanti iuuenis cum fervidus ore
munera Martis init coram duce militibusque
vulnera et incerti miserantibus ardua belli.*

Supp. 10.301–304

Not otherwise does fear engulf his hammering heart, when the eager youth fights for the first time with gasping breath in the presence of his commander and soldiers—who pity him for the wounds and hardships of risky war to come.

Pio here neglects the psychological horror of the Apollonian simile to concentrate on the adrenaline surge of physical fear, forcing an irrational correspondence between the tyro soldier and the exhausted warriors of the *Argonautica*.

46 See Kobusch (2004) 463–464 on this and other moments of praise for Bologna.

Nor is there a direct correspondence for the complicating factor in the simile, the compassion felt by the already battle-hardened soldiers. But, as Beate Kobusch convincingly suggests, the pity focalized through the soldiers within the simile refracts the emotional charge demanded of the readers outside it, who should be feeling compassion for the Argonauts.⁴⁷

This invitation to empathize once again forges a bridge between the classical past and contemporary life. Though it is only a passing moment in a catalogue of terrifying experiences to be endured by the Argonauts, it also suggests a larger sense of compassion within the *Supplement* on Pio's part that can be traced right back to its first major episode, the murder of Absyrtus. There, Pio offered an insight into the horrific moment at which Absyrtus realized he was being attacked by Jason, and tried to react. Throughout the *Supplement*, the changes he has made, as have we have seen, often raise the emotional stakes, offering a vision of Medea who is more menaced by the Colchians than even in Apollonius, a Jason who is more susceptible to love than his classical forebears. In this innovative simile—carefully and closely woven into the larger translation and imitation project of the *Supplement*—Pio offers a microcosmic encapsulation of the value of his continuation more broadly. His ambition is not only to “finish off” Valerius’ *Argonautica* in a manner which continues the closely-interlinked relationship of Apollonius and Valerius that he had already explicated in his commentary. Pio also aims to bring that *Argonautica* back to life, animating it as a text which can speak to his contemporary readers as a relevant and engaging experience.

Bibliography

- Augoustakis, Antony (ed.) (2014) *Flavian Poetry and its Greek Past. Mnemosyne supplements. Monographs on Greek and Roman language and literature*, 366. Leiden; Boston.
- Barich, M.J. (1982) *Aspects of the Poetic Technique of Valerius Flaccus*. Diss. Yale.
- Barich, M.J. (2014) “Poet and Readers: Reflections on the Verbal and Narrative Art of Valerius Flaccus’ *Argonautica*”, in Heerink and Manuwald (2014) 29–48.
- Bernstein, N.W. (2014) “*Romanas veluti saevissima cum legiones Tisiphone regesque movet*: Valerius Flaccus’ *Argonautica* and the Flavian Era”, in Heerink and Manuwald (2014) 154–169.

47 Kobusch (2004) 532–533.

- Bessone, F. (1991) "Valerio Flacco e l'Apollonio commentato: proposte", *MD* 26: 31–46.
- Braund, D. (1993) "Writing a Roman *Argonautica*: The Historical Dynamic", *Hermathena* 154: 11–17.
- Conte, G.B. (1986) *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Ithaca/London.
- Ehlers, W.-W. (ed.) (1980) *Gai Valeri Flacci Argonauticon libri octo*. Leipzig.
- Ehlers, W.-W. (2001) Review of Glei-Köhler (1998), *MLatJb* 36: 370–374.
- Ferri, Ferruccio (1920) *Una contesa di tre umanisti: Basinio, Porcellio e Seneca. Contributo alla storia degli studi greci nel quattrocento in Italia*. Pavia.
- Fränkel, H. (ed.) (1970) *Apollonii Rhodii, Argonautica*. Oxford.
- Fucecchi, M. (ed.) (1997) *La teichoscopia e l'innamoramento di Medea: saggio di commento a Valerio Flacco, Argonautiche* 6, 427–760. Pisa.
- Glei, R. and Köhler, M. (eds) (1998) *Maffeo Vegio. Vellus Aureum—Das Goldene Vlies (1431). Einleitung, kritische Edition, Übersetzung*. BAC 38. Trier.
- Hardie, P.R. (1997) "Closure in Latin Epic", In Roberts et al. (1997) 139–162.
- Hardie, P.R. (1993) *The Epic Successors of Virgil. A Study in the Dynamics of a Tradition*. Cambridge.
- Harmand, R. (1898) *De Valerio Flacco Apollonii Rhodii Imitatore*. Paris.
- Heerink, Mark and Manuwald, Gesine (eds) (2014) *Brill's Companion to Valerius Flaccus*. Brill's Companions in Classical Studies. Leiden; Boston.
- Hershkovitz, D. (1998) *Valerius Flaccus' Argonautica: abbreviated voyages in silver Latin epic*. Oxford.
- Hunter, R.L. (1993a) *The Argonautica of Apollonius: Literary Studies*. Cambridge. (1993b) *Jason and the golden fleece (the Argonautica)*. Oxford.
- Hunter, R.L. (2001) "The Poetics of Narrative in the *Argonautica*", in Papanghelis and Rengakos (2001) 115–146.
- Hull, K.W.D. (1975) "Medea in Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*", *PLLS* 16: 1–25.
- Kobusch, Beate (ed.) (2004) *Das "Argonautica"-Supplement des Giovanni Battista Pio: Einleitung, Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Trier.
- Newman, J.K. (2008) "The Golden Fleece: Imperial Dream", in Papanghelis and Rengakos (2008) 413–444.
- Papanghelis, Theodore D. and Rengakos, Antonios (eds) (2001) *A Companion to Apollonius Rhodius*. Leiden.
- Putnam, M.C.J. (ed.) (2004) *Maffeo Vegio. Short Epics*. ITRL 15. Cambridge, London.
- Resta, Gianvito (1981) "Vegio, Basinio e l'argonautica di Apollonio Rodio", *Miscellanea Augusto Campana* 2: 639–669.
- Rieker, J. (1998) "Das Supplement des Johannes Baptista Pius Bononiensis zu den *Argonautica* des Valerius Flaccus", in Eigler U. and Lefèvre, E. with Manuwald, G. (eds) *Ratis omnia vincet. Neue Untersuchungen zu den Argonautica des Valerius Flaccus*. Zetemata 98. München. 357–363.

- Roberts, Deborah H., Dunn, Francis M. and Fowler, Don (eds) (1997) *Classical Closure: Reading the End in Greek and Latin Literature*. Princeton.
- Robinson, D. (1997) *Western Translation Theory: from Herodotus to Nietzsche*. Manchester.
- Schade, Gerson and Eleuteri, Paolo (1997) "The Textual Tradition of the *Argonautica*", in Papangelis and Rengakos (2008) 29–51.
- Schimann, F. (1997) "Feuer auf Lemnos: Feuer und Furie in den *Argonautica* des Valerius Flaccus", in Baier, Thomas and Schimann, Frank (eds) *Fabrica: Studien zur antiken Literatur und ihrer Rezeption*. Stuttgart. 103–128.
- Smith, B. (1968) *Poetic Closure: A Study of How Poems End*. Chicago.
- Stover, Tim (2011) "Unexamined Exemplarity: Medea in the *Argonautica* of Valerius Flaccus", *TAPA* 141: 171–200.
- Taylor-Briggs, Ruth (2014) "*Utere bono tuo feliciter*: The Textual Transmission and Manuscript History of Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*", in Heerink and Manuwald (2014) 9–28.
- Toohey, P. (1994) "Epic and Rhetoric: Speech-making and Persuasion in Homer and Apollonius", *Arachnion* 1: <http://www.cisi.unito.it/arachne/num1/toohey.html>.
- Venini, P. (1971) "Valerio Flacco e l'erudizione apollaniana. Note stilistiche", *RIL* 105: 582–596.
- Vignati, Bruno (1959) *Maffeo Vegio; umanista cristiano, 1407–1548*. Bergamo.
- Zissos, Andrew (2006) "Reception of Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*", *International Journal of the Classical Tradition* 13: 165–185.
- Zissos, Andrew (2012) "The king's daughter: Medea in Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*", *Ramus* 41: 94–118.
- Zissos, Andrew (2014) "'Interpres operis alieni?' Giovan Battista Pio's continuation of Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*", in Heerink and Manuwald (2014) 361–380.

Redressing Caesar as Dido in Thomas May's Continuations of Lucan

Robert Simms

When Thomas May died in 1650—strangled, according to scurrilous rumour, by a pair of bonnet strings that he had tied too tightly beneath his corpulent chin after a night of heavy drinking—his translation and continuation of Lucan's unfinished *Bellum Civile* secured for him a literary legacy both firm and favourable. He was a keen and able student of Latin and the classics with a promising future. After his father, Thomas May Sr., passed away deeply in arrears, the privileged life for which he had been groomed was lost. An embarrassing stammer further laid unfavourable odds of success in the law courts. Thus he sought his livelihood, as many others had, by courting a literary muse and produced much else besides work on Lucan: dramas, translations, historical poems, and political writings, all of which varied in success from uneven to well-received.¹ Nothing, however, matched the success of his work in translating and augmenting Lucan's unfinished poem; it remained the star to which May's fame would be hitched. Indeed, an epitaph prepared by Marchamont Needham chiselled into his grave marker at Westminster Abbey praised May as *Lucanus alter plusquam Romanus*, "another Lucan, more than Roman".

May had sided with Parliament against Charles I, though initially a supporter, at least at court. May's allegiances shifted, so the historical gossip goes, when his lobby to be appointed poet laureate as Ben Jonson's literary successor failed in 1637.² The honour went instead to Sir William Davenant. A few years later, in 1639, May was passed over as the Chronicler of the City of London. This may have been the consequence of Charles electing not to ratify anything passed to him by parliament, and not a matter May could have taken as a personal or even professional slight. In any event and for whatever reason, May took up the cause of Parliament against monarchy. After the Restoration, when it was safe to attack the dead, condemnation of May was also achieved through

1 For a complete bibliography of May's work see Chester (1932) 189–196.

2 In fairness, May was one of hundreds of literary men drooling over the prestigious position and it is unlikely that this disappointment alone was sufficient to create a break in loyalties. Chester (1932) 22–24 raises the possibility that his time at Sidney Sussex, Cambridge, with its strong Puritan leanings, and where Cromwell had also studied, had influenced May's politics much earlier on.

Lucan. Before Royalists had May's remains disinterred and re-deposited in a pit at St. Margaret's Church in 1661 just outside Westminster Abbey, a *siste viator* responding to Needham's epitaph was fixed to his grave marker linking May to Lucan as "an ungrateful traitor to his prince" and the difference between the two being that Lucan repented at his death, and May died too suddenly to have a chance to repent. Still, for as much as May channels Lucan, he works also with and against other influences. This chapter will discuss the reception of May's work on Lucan, his efforts to create a closure for his translation of the *Bellum Civile*; and examine the Virgilian influence on the second book of May's English Continuation and Latin Supplement, with especial regard for the way in which the Dido-Aeneas paradigm is flipped in order to redress Caesar as Dido in his dalliance with Cleopatra.

Continuing Lucan

May's continuation projects come in two versions, both treating the same material. There is the English *A Continuation of Lucan's Historical Poem till the death of Julius Caesar*, published in 1630. And the Latin *Supplementum Lucani*, published in Leiden in 1640. The Latin work was highly acclaimed, especially abroad, and occupies a unique place in literature for having been published alongside Lucan's epic for over two centuries.³ As a Latin work, the *Supplementum* had the esteem of Samuel Johnson, who put May's Latin verse superior to Milton and Cowley, though Walter Savage Landor positions May after Milton among the best Anglo-Latin poets.⁴ Such esteem led Anthony à Wood to proclaim that May's Latin epic was "written in so lofty and happy Latin hexameter that he hath attained to much more reputation abroad than he hath lost at home."⁵ Despite its praise and wide readership interest in the neo-Latin, *Supplementum* has been hobbled by the publication a decade earlier of May's *A Continuation of Lucan's Historical Poem till the Death of Julius Caesar*, which puts the Latin work within a suspicious sphere of self-translation. While the order of publication does not give conclusive evidence that the English *Continuation* preceded its Latin counterpart, Bruère points out a number of differences between the two works that are sufficient to suggest the Latin is a later adaptation of the earlier English work.⁶ Most scholars prefer Chester's

3 See Poulter (1786) 1 and Bradner (1966) 71–72.

4 Bradner (1966) 71 and Binns (1990) 154.

5 Wood (1817) 810.

6 Bruère (1949) 145–163.

view that there is simply no way of knowing which came before which, or even perhaps parts growing up alongside each other.⁷ The prevailing notion that the Latin follows an English original leads scholars to treat the *Supplementum* as a crib, unworthy of more serious attention.⁸ Nevertheless, scholars frequently argue for a discernible shift in May's political concerns between the English *Continuation* and the Latin *Supplementum*.⁹

The End and Scope of Lucan's *Bellum Civile*

In the final book of Lucan's *Bellum Civile*, Caesar arrives in Egypt, where he visits the tomb of Alexander the Great, is hosted by Ptolemy, meets Cleopatra, enjoys a lengthy discourse on the Nile, and endures two assassination efforts. In the final scene, the Egyptians have the besieged Caesar trapped on the Heptastadion mole. His prospects are dire. He doubts escape and the book closes with Caesar seeing the image of Scaeva before him. The abrupt ending of Lucan's epic raises questions for readers that prove to be as contentious as they are difficult to resolve. Put broadly the questions fall into two categories. First, is the epic finished or unfinished? That is, does the poem finish how and where the author intended? Efforts to demonstrate that the end of the *Bellum Civile* is an intentional literary act are recent interpretations.¹⁰ Medieval and early Modern readers were not inclined to a similar view and considered the epic unfinished, the incompleteness due most probably to Lucan's ordered suicide for his involvement in the Pisonian conspiracy to assassinate Nero.¹¹ Indeed, most readers wished, as May had bid in the prefatory poem *The Complaint of Calliope against the Destinies*, which opens the first publication of the *Continuation*, that fate might have prolonged "that thread awhile, until stately song / Of his Pharsalia had been finish'd quite."¹² If the position that the epic is incomplete is taken by readers then two further questions emerge: how would Lucan

7 Chester (1932) 156.

8 In the two major studies of Anglo-Latin literature, May garners little more than a mention. Bradner (1966) 71 concedes the "remarkable history" of May's Latin but is unwilling to consider him alongside those of the other Anglo-Latin worthies in his study. Binns (1990) 195 offers not more than a nod.

9 See Cliff (1999) 79–81 and Backhaus (2005) 69–74. On Lucan in May's politics generally see Norbrook (1993) 45–66, Norbrook (1999) 225–228, and Paleit (2013) 215–254.

10 See Masters (1992) 216–259, Tracy (2011) 33–53, and Paleit (2013) 255–258.

11 As recounted in Tacitus *Ann.* 15.49, 56–57, 70.

12 *A Continuation* (1630), sig. A4r.

have completed the scene if he wanted to provide what we might anachronistically consider closure? And looking further ahead, had Lucan continued his poem, to what point in Rome's history would he have continued?

Let us consider how May responds to the first of these two questions. By the time of his translation, it appears to have become conventional to offer some form of closure for Lucan's epic. In his 1493 commentary, Giovanni Sulpizio (Sulpitius) composed an 11-verse *appendicula* to cauterize the open end of Caesar's final scene.¹³ Both Gorges and May imitated Sulpitius' coda for the endings of their translations. May quadruples Sulpitius' conclusion so that Caesar, inspired by the remembrance of Scaeva and finding no safety aboard the ships, dives into the Nile and swims ashore: "Now all alone on seas doth Caesar floate / Himselfe the Oares, the Pilot, and the Boate" and concludes:

Two hundred paces thus alone he swam
Till to the body of his Fleet he came
His ore-joy'd Soldiers shouting to the skies
Take sure presage of future victoryes.¹⁴

Since both May's *Continuation* and *Supplementum* begin with a vexed Caesar on shore, cheered and welcomed by his soldiers on the Nile's banks, this passage forms a bridge between where Lucan ends and where May begins, and makes a seamless transition from one to the other.¹⁵ And, of course, the "sure presage of future Victories" could point to May's own anticipation of success through opening further narrative possibilities for Caesar in his *Continuation*.¹⁶ May's first book then proceeds through Caesar's war with Ptolemy, who will in the end drown when his small boat, filled with so many men trying to flee Caesar, capsizes.

Of course, whether in conjecture or practice, the assumption that the *Bellum Civile* is incomplete raises the further question of where, after the immediate scene concludes, Lucan might have closed the work.¹⁷ May's *Continuation* takes what he suggests to be the remaining narrative material to the death of Caesar.

13 Notably, May's *Supplementum* includes Sulpitius' verses among its prefatory material.

14 *Lucan's Pharsalia* (1627), sig. T4v.

15 Bradner (1966) 72.

16 Since there was but the span of roughly three years between the appearance of the complete ten books of *Lucan's Pharsalia* (1627) and May's *Continuation* (1630), it seems entirely reasonable to suppose the project was on May's mind by this time.

17 For review of the several arguments see Ahl (1976) 306–326. More recently, Stover (2008) 571–580 favours the death of Cato as the intended scope.

In so doing, he turns the civil war history into a chronicle of Caesar's remaining life and death.¹⁸ Fanshawe, however, in dedicatory verses to the *Supplementum*, urged May to carry the historical scope on to Actium. But whatever trajectory Lucan may have pursued, it is unlikely that he would have returned to Caesar's affair with Cleopatra, an interlude that among historians did not amount to much anyway.¹⁹ Of course, had Lucan's *Bellum Civile* continued on to Actium, then Cleopatra could likely have resurfaced as Antony's paramour, which Lucan may allude to at 10.70–73. In any case, the bulk of May's second book concerns Caesar's nine-month dalliance with Cleopatra in Egypt. Since the episode has no necessity for the historical narrative and the relationship between the two has been adequately (albeit cursorily) covered by Lucan in *Bellum Civile* 10, we are forced to conclude that May sought to indulge his creative muse. Moreover, May's use of Lucan dissipates as a model in this second book where he adopts a more Virgilian and parodic tack.

Lucan's Caesar and Cleopatra

Scholars have long noted the Aenean parallels between Caesar's tarrying in Egypt and Aeneas' protracted stay with Dido at Carthage.²⁰ In broad outline, the correspondences remain reasonably stable: Caesar, like Aeneas, neglects his duties in preference for indulgence and romance with a foreign queen.²¹ When pressed, naturally, the similarities do begin to attenuate. When May restructures the analogue for his second book, however, he flips the his model in order to recast Caesar in the role of Dido. Unlike Aeneas at Carthage, Caesar does not marvel at the buildings and art, at least not at first (10.17–18). He is, however, keen to visit the cave that is believed to entomb Alexander the Great. While Caesar falls from view, Lucan reviews Alexander's career, and the narrator discourses freely and critically on tyrants and tyranny without being

18 See Rossi (2005) 256–257.

19 On this possibility see Ahl (1976) 316.

20 See Zwierlein (1974) 54–73 and Berti (2000) 17–18 and 94. On Cleopatra as a model for Dido see Keith (2000) 68 and Rossi (2005) 238–239.

21 These parallels also extend to Antony's affair with Cleopatra, which had considerable currency in early modern literature. See Adelman (1973) 71–101 and Bono (1984) 7–40. The later affair likely supplants that of Caesar in literature because their love historically anticipates a tragic end. See also Bertman (2000), Galinsky (2003), and Bono (2006).

overheard (10.19–52).²² Ptolemy hosts a royal banquet where Cleopatra bribes her gendarme and arranges to meet Caesar and requests his aid. Lucan describes Cleopatra in the same condemnatory tones as his Augustan predecessors.²³ Lucan's perspective differs from that of his Augustan predecessors only in that he identifies her by name. For Lucan she is the shame of Egypt, a venomous fury, and a second Helen:

*dedecus Aegypti, Latii feralis Erinys,
Romano non casta malo. quantum inpulit Argos
Iliacasque domos facie Spartana nocenti,
Hesperios auxit tantum Cleopatra furores.
terrui illa suo, si fas, Capitolia sistro
et Romana petit inbelli signa Canopo
Caesare captiuo Pharios ductura triumphos;
Leucadioque fuit dubius sub gurgite casus,
an mundum ne nostra quidem matrona teneret.
hoc animi nox illa dedit quae prima cubili
miscuit incestam ducibus Ptolemaida nostris.
quis tibi uaesani ueniam non donet amoris,
Antoni, durum cum Caesaris hauserit ignis
pectus?*

Bellum Civile 10.59–72

May translates the passage thus:

The staine of Ægypt, Romes pernicious
Fury, unchast to Italyes disgrace,
As much as Helena's bewitching face
Fatall to Troy, and her owne Greeks did proove,
As much Romes broiles did Cleopatra moove.
Our Capitall the with her Sistrum fear'd,
With Aegypts base effoeminate tout prepar'd
To seize Romes Eagles, and triumph get

²² See Ahl (1976) 223–224 and Rossi (2005) 244–251.

²³ E.g. Horace 1.37 and Propertius 3.11. Notably, until the early Modern period Cleopatra does not have a substantial voice of her own, and exists wholly as an object of externalized opinion and value. So Wyke (2002) 110 argues “any attempt to accommodate Cleopatra within Rome and systems for political validation, and to justify her public powers in Roman times, would be fraught with difficulty.”

Or a captiv'd Cæsar

...

Who would not pardon Anthonyes mad love,
When Caesars flinty breast desires could move
In midst of war, when heat of fight rag'd most,
And in a court haunted by Pompeys ghost?²⁴

And when Lucan wearies of hurling abuses, he has Cleopatra's traitorous eunuch Pothinus continue condemning her as an incestuous whore. In *Bellum Civile* 10 she easily charms Caesar, and, according to Lucan, if she could win over Caesar, it should be no surprise that she subdued Antony as well. Under the influence of such seductive power it is understandable that lesser men, such as Antony, could be seduced by her charms, if she could draw a spark of fire from even Caesar's flinty heart (10.70–72). Indeed, Caesar is keen here in Egypt to mix love and arms, and for shame (*pro pudor!*, 77) forget about his Julia and Rome, while the foreign queen deceitfully petitions Caesar *sine ullis / Tristis adit lacrimis* (82–83). And Cleopatra wins him over to her cause.

Despite her seductive beauty, *faciesque incesta* (104–105), what compels Caesar's gaze most is not really Cleopatra at all, but the wealth she parades before him. She strains beneath the weight of so much wealth: *Divitias Cleopatra genit cultuque laborat* (10.140). Lucan's description of Cleopatra builds to a savage condemnation of her foolishness in exciting Caesar with a parade of riches and tempting such a covetous and avaricious man, one, so one who desires to have the whole world. It is folly, madness, stupidity to display such wealth before Caesar, wealth that even the most venerable of ancient generals—Fabricius, Curius, Cincinnatus—would want to claim and display for Rome. And Caesar wants it for himself! Egypt teaches Caesar how to squander wealth: *Discit opes Caesar spoliat: perdere mundi, / Et gessisse, audet genero cum paupere bellum* (10.169–170). For all her beauty, splendour, and guile, it is the wealth Lucan's Caesar is most moved by, wealth Caesar has not seen since his days with Juba, that most entices him. For Lucan the core of their affair appears to be resolved with these accusations and there is not much more to say about the two together. Lucan has introduced Caesar to Cleopatra and assassinated the character of each. The affair does not require further elaboration, yet in the second book of his continuations May revisits their interlude with considerable elaboration.

24 Lucan's *Pharsalia* (1627), sig. S2.

Return to Egypt's Splendours

May appears to have taken a special interest in Cleopatra. In his salad days with the theatre he wrote *The Tragedie of Cleopatra, Queene of Ægypt*, acted in 1626 and published over a decade later in 1639. The play concerns Cleopatra's later career and despite treating the same material as Shakespeare's *Antony and Cleopatra*, appears to have limited the bard's influence and attempted to distinguish itself from his dramatic forerunner.²⁵ Notably, May eschews the romantic relationship between Cleopatra and Antony in favour of more political concerns and an exploration of the difficult decisions made in times of conflict.²⁶ In foreseeing her defeat, Cleopatra hopes that in seducing Octavius/Augustus as she had Caesar and Antony, she will be able to live an honourable life.²⁷ While Cleopatra does not attain the same prominence in May's continuations, a strain of political concern persists. Her motivations in May's continuations are largely political and this seems to be a preferred position for May as it occurs also in his earlier play *Cleopatra: regni insana cupido* (2.76).²⁸ When Caesar must take his leave of her, Cleopatra expresses "seeming grief" at his departure: *At blandis Cleopatra dolis instructa* (2.306). The falsity or pretence with which Cleopatra is often presented is not unknown to Caesar either, as Putnam points out *titulo pietatis* (10.363).²⁹ May clearly felt that there was room yet to do more with the romantic tryst of the infamous couple and after the defeat of Ptolemy in the first book he returns Caesar to Cleopatra to further present their historic interlude.

After Caesar's just and victorious war against Ptolemy in the first book of his continuations, May begins the second book by describing how the people of Alexandria feast and sacrifice to their gods in thanks to Caesar, little knowing how much they owe to Cleopatra's charm and the shamefulness with which she purchased the *Memphitica sceptrum*. To celebrate the defeat of Ptolemy and demonstrate her gratitude, Cleopatra holds a great banquet, hosting Caesar. This scene revisits the banquet held at the opening of Lucan's *Bellum Civile* 10, and is itself a reflection of Dido's banquet for Aeneas in *Aeneid* 1. Instead of being taken in by the wealth, however, the eyes of May's Caesar devour Cleopatra's beauty.

25 See Berry (1964) xlvii–lxii for discussion of the relationship between the two plays.

26 Jensen (2012) 165.

27 Hatchuel (2011) 91–94.

28 See also 2.87–90.

29 Putnam (1995) 231. For comparative discussion of Lucan and May's characterizations of Cleopatra see Backhaus (2009) 347–371.

May signals his revisitation of the Cleopatra and Caesar interlude through an imitation of *Bellum Civile* 10.17–19 and 10.144–145. Recall that in Lucan's final book Caesar initially takes no interest in Egyptian splendour and desires only to visit the tomb of Alexander the Great:

*et nulla captus dulcedine rerum,
non auro cultuque deum, non moenibus urbis
effossum tumulis cupide descendit in antrum*

10.17–19

But there delighted with no objects sweetnesse,
Nor with their gold, nor gods majestic dresse,
Nor lofty city walls, with greedinesse
Into the burying vault goes Caesar downe.³⁰

This initial response to Egypt strikes an anti-Aenean note, where Aeneas initially marvelled at what he saw of Carthage (*Aen.* 1.418.40). Afterward, however, Caesar is overwhelmed by the opulence and wealth of the palace. As he banquets with Ptolemy, Caesar's gaze is dominated by an array of conspicuous wealth. At 10.111–126 Lucan describes the wealth of the palace: it's marble, alabaster, ebony, tortoise-shell, and assorted jewels. Then, on the entrance of Cleopatra,

*plena maris rubri spoliis, colloque comisque
diuitias Cleopatra gerit cultuque laborat.
candida Sidonio perlucet pectora filo,
quod Nilotis acus conpressum pectine Serum
soluit et extenso laxauit stamina uelo.
dentibus hic niueis sectos Atlantide silua
inposuere orbes, quales ad Caesaris ora
nec capto uenere Iuba.*

10.139–146

Laden with pearls the red seas spoiled store
On her rich hair, and weary'd neck she wore.
Her snowy breasts their whiteness did display

30 *Lucans Pharsalia* (1627) sig. Sv.

Thorough the thinn Sidonian tiffenay
 Wrought, and extended by the curious hand
 Of Ægypt's workmen. Citron tables stand
 On Ivory tressells, such as Caesar's eyes
 Saw not, when hee King Juba did surprise.³¹

The English *Continuation* has Lucan's passage firmly in mind as it signals a revisitation of the original scene, especially with reference to the ivory tressells, which indicate a degree of wealth that Caesar has not seen since his days with Juba. But May's Caesar cares not for these things. Lucan presents Cleopatra as something of a garnish, rather than an object of interest on her own. Indeed, Cleopatra suffers under the weight of so much wealth, her function is primarily to present her riches, to parade them before Caesar in an effort, reckless according to Lucan, to catch Caesar by his avarice. But this wealth that formerly fed Caesar is curtailed in May's revisitation. After a description of the political corruption fostered by riches, May contraindicates his Lucanian source by having Caesar ignore the wealth he formerly saw:

But Caesar's eyes in all the wealthy store,
 Which he so lately had beheld before,
 No pleasure finde, nor with delight viewes he
 The golden roofes, nor precious imag'ry,
 Riche Eben pillars, boords of Citron wood,
 Which on their carued Iuory tressells stood:
 Nor curious hangings doe his eyes admire.
 For Cleopatra's beautie, and attire
 Did quite eclipse all obiects, and outshone
 All other splendours³²

*Sed non divitiae, non auro fulva supellex,
 Gemmative tori passim, pictive tapetes,
 Caesareos pascunt oculos, nec talia curat,
 Dum prope sidereo cunctis splendoribus ore
 Praeradiat, vultuque movet Cleopatra superbo.*

2.23–27

31 *Lucans Pharsalia* (1627) sig. Sr.

32 *A Continuation* (1630), sig. C4v.

The connection to Lucan is unmistakable, and we might suppose the anti-Aenean “Nor curious hangings doe his eyes admire” is added just to indicate to readers that May understood how Lucan was building on Virgil.

For Lucan, Cleopatra’s show of excess and wealth suggest that she herself has no substantial beauty of her own, she is a decorated figure and servant to her wealth, such that she pants and labours under so much adornment. She would seem comparatively immodest alongside the female figures that Lucan presents (e.g. Marcia, Julia), who do not employ such ostentation and gross displays of themselves or their value. Her beauty is secondary to her trappings and quite literally, as she holds up the wealth to display it, a prop. Nevertheless, May’s Caesar observes Cleopatra differently. May builds on and imitates Lucan’s description, down to the ivory tusk table legs. He similarly offers a fulsome description of Cleopatra’s jewellery, but rather than labour under the weight of her jewellery, their dazzling brilliance detracts from, rather than adds to her comeliness: “The wealth she wore about her, seem’d to hide / Not to adorne her native beauties pride.”³³ In the *Continuation* May offers sixteen verses on her pearls, silver, gold, emeralds, onyx, diamonds, sapphires, and rubies which “seem’d to lose their die / When her more ruby lips were moving by.”³⁴

May’s Caesar takes a second look and sees Cleopatra, whose appearance, and his response to it, emphasize the pathology of erotic desire. The description is characterized by images of a clinging unshakable image of the object of desire as well as the notion of that desire being similar to a flame. At *Supplementum* 2.28–29 the image of Cleopatra clings to Caesar’s heart, and the more he sees the more he burns: *Hanc uidet, huic oculis et pectore totus in haeret; / Quoque magis cernit, magis ardet*, which May offers in the *Continuation* as:

His eyes are fix’d; which, though beheld before
The more he views, doe ravish him the more
All other objects lose at second sight;
But woman’s beautie breeds the more delight
The after seene³⁵

May pardons his elaborate revisitation and embellishment of Caesar’s gaze with “though beheld before”, which refers to Caesar’s initial introduction to Cleopatra in *Bellum Civile* 10. Notably, May’s Latin in this passage presents a

33 *A Continuation* (1630), sig. C4v.

34 The Latin comes in with slight difference: ‘... *labra Rubinus / Non rosea æquaret, nisi primo victa fuisset, / Et pudor augetet quem dat Natura ruborem* (2.43–45).

35 *A Continuation* (1630), sig. C4v.

structural affinity with *Aeneid* 1.171–178, in which Dido fixates on Cupid's false Ascanius: ... *haec oculis, haec pectore toto / haeret*.³⁶

In response to this second sighting of Cleopatra, Caesar gives way to his passion, and allows himself to be consumed by the flame of desire. Caesar's love for Cleopatra is a wound and a fire:

*Ausonius ductor iamdudum sacius ignem
Concipit inde novum, nimioque accenditur aestu
Nec placidam celere studet, sed pascere, flammam.*
Supp 2.46–48

But Caesar's heart enflamed long before
Burns with fresh fury, and resolves no more
Now to conceale but feed the pleasing flame³⁷

Notice in the Latin text Caesar, having long since (*iamdudum*) been wounded, does double duty to both signal the Virgilian intertext and allude to the earlier sighting of Cleopatra at *Bellum Civile* 10.56–154. But where he was then taken by wealth, he is now smitten. Caesar is consumed, or more properly, allows himself to be consumed, by the pleasing fires of love and desire. Thus, Lucan foregrounds Caesar's avarice, May his lust. In addition, *saucius* and *iamdudum* signal an intertext between May's passage and the opening of *Aeneid* 4 where the image of Aeneas dwells in Dido's heart:

At regina graui *iamdudum* saucia cura
uulnus alit uenis et caeco carpitur igni.
multa uiri uirtus animo multusque recursat
gentis honos; haerent infixi pectore uultus
uerbaque nec *placidam* membris dat cura quietem.
Aen. 4.1–5

Now though, the queen long since pierced through by her terrible
anguish,
Nurtures the wound with her veins. Passion's blind fire feeds on the
harvest.

36 Compare also *ardescitque tuendo* (*Aen.* 1.718), where Dido is burned in looking at "love" in the form of Cupid.

37 *A Continuation* (1630), sig. C5r.

Images course through her mind: of his courage, his family distinction.
 Each word he's spoken is fixed in her heart, each facial expression.
 Anguish grants no peaceful repose, no respite for tired limbs.³⁸

May's metaphors for the pathology of erotic desire now incorporate wounding, which makes explicit the connection between Caesar and Dido. Note also in the Latin how May punts aside Virgil's *quitem* in the final position that attends *placidam* in order to redouble the igneous imagery with *flammam*. This image quite possibly can also extend to the hind simile (4.68–73), and occurs again where Virgil notes *ardet amans Dido traxitque per ossa furorem* (4.100). But it is not necessary to press the connections too far; May makes the necessary connections between Dido's love for Aeneas and Caesar's passion for Cleopatra.

May draws these two passages describing Caesar's passion for Cleopatra not from Lucan, but from the *Aeneid*, to introduce a parodic Virgilian intertext. He applies notions of a beloved's clinging image, love as a wound, love as a burning fire, which Virgil used to describe Dido's pitiful state and transposes them onto Caesar. To be sure, somatic descriptions of love and erotic desire being associated with illness are not unique in this sense or the exclusive preserve of Virgil. We certainly identify them as early as Sappho (fr. 31.10) and are ubiquitous throughout classical, medieval, and early modern literature.³⁹ Still, the strong intertextual association to *Aeneid* 5.1–4 and the revisitation of Caesar's interlude with Cleopatra, which Lucan had modelled on the affair between Dido and Aeneas, allows May to create a parody of his own Lucanic model by recasting Caesar as Dido in the romantic tryst, flipping the lover-beloved model of his predecessor. And in doing so, May reframes the episode to present Caesar's overriding fault as, by the conventions of the milieu in which May wrote, an "unmanly" passion for Cleopatra.

Cleopatra and the Feminization of Men

May's redress of Caesar as Dido draws on the historic characterization of Cleopatra as an emasculator of men. Cleopatra, in no shortage of instances, embodies this threat to masculinity. May builds his Cleopatra on Lucan's model and works within long-standing historical and literary convention.⁴⁰ Clearly there

38 Ahl (2007) 77.

39 Pease (1935) 145 notes the Hellenistic quality of Virgil's description of Dido's passion for Aeneas.

40 Backhaus (2009) 347–370.

are platitudes at work, foremost of which is the notion of a woman, as the object of erotic desire, as a threat to progress. For Romans such degeneracy was a political and military hazard.⁴¹ The general notion of women leading to the ruin of men is as old as it is persistent. In Plato's *Republic*, Socrates counts women, when their purpose is for pleasure rather than for breeding, as a luxury that brings feverish ill-health to the polis. Cicero also attacks sexual luxury and indulgences as leading to military weakness (*De Officiis* 1.30). Seneca attacks sexual luxury and indulgences as leading to military weakness (*Epistle* 124). Livy examines how Hannibal's men are weakened after wintering in Capua, and perform poorly in subsequent battles (23.18.10–16).⁴² Silius puts the matter more poetically where Venus sends spritely cupids to wound and soften the hearts of Hannibal and his men with luxury (*Punica* 11.385–390). This incident, either by way of Livy or Silius (probably both) was in May's mind when he has Marcus Titius compare Antony in Alexandria to Hannibal at Capua:⁴³

Minutius Plancus, I was thinking now
How *Hannibal* was charmed at Capua,
When that delicious place had mollifi'd
His rough and cruell soul, and made him learn
The lessons of soft love, and luxury.⁴⁴

So too May follows the commonplace, and while Caesar tarries with Cleopatra, Scipio unites the scattered nations in Africa; and in an epic catalogue, May presents Marmarians, Numidians, Massylinas, Getulians, Autoules, Mibians, Cyniphians, Adyrmachdes, and troops from Vaga, Ruspina, and Zamag preparing "t' invade thier native Countrey, and set free / Subiected Rome from Caesar's Tyrannie."⁴⁵

41 As Phang (2001) 359–363 notes, "Civil War is caused by lack of self-control, by luxuria and avaritia of the Roman elite, who teach these vices to their soldiers."

42 Similarly, the historian Florus (1.24) records that King Antiochus of Syria won the Greek islands but after indulging in *otia et luxus* fell easily to the Romans.

43 This initial scene might also have been influenced by Shakespeare's opening to *Antony and Cleopatra* (1.4.4–7), as Octavian tells Lepidus that Antony "is not more manlike than Cleopatra". Indeed, the early modern notion of feminine beauty as emasculating can also be found when Romeo cries: "O sweet Juliet, / Thy beauty hath made me effeminate / And in my temper softened valor's steel!" (*Romeo & Juliet* 3.1.75–77).

44 *Cleopatra*, sig. BL5.

45 *A Continuation* (1630), sig. Dv1. May renders the lines in Latin: *in Latium belli casum transferre futuri* (2.191).

While Caesar indulges himself, May describes him as *captus* (2.198) and *oblitus* (2.200), and pairs his situation to that of Hercules and Iole:

*Talibus illecebris, et molli fractus amore,
Formosae Oechalidos reginae dicitur olim
Maximus Alcides: humeros non fulva leonis
Terga Cleonaei velant, nodosave fortem
Clava armat dextram; domitores mille laborum
Desidiâ incipiunt duri torpere lacerti.*

Supplementum 2.200–212

As when Alcides with ill fate had seene
The tempting beauties of th' Oechalian Queene,
His brawny shoulders straight forget to weare
The lions skin, his awful hand to beare
The monster-taming club; from his rough head
The poplar garland falls; no tyrants dread
That world-auenging strength; which had well nigh
Beene sunke into a famelesse lethargy.

The comparison of Caesar to Hercules further reinforces Cleopatra's power and makes allusion to an instance of cross-dressing and effeminization. Under the spell of Iole, Hercules lets his lion-skin and mighty club drop. Tyrants are no longer frightened, and a woman brings Hercules to ruin far more capably than all the plagues and monsters Juno could muster. Notably, Iole and Omphale are sometimes conflated in the Renaissance.⁴⁶ Thomas Cooper's entry in the *Dictionarium* (sub. *Iole*) records that she was "the daughter of Eurytus King of Aetolia, whom Hercules loved so much, that he served hir in a womans appareil, and spanne on a distaff." Such an allusion to cross-dressing, as we see of Antony when he is with Cleopatra, in Plutarch and Shakespeare, strengthens May's portraiture of Caesar "softened" under Cleopatra. Of course, by implication Cleopatra's motivations, marked by falsity, deceit, treachery, and a mad desire to reign, situate her within a political and masculine sphere.⁴⁷ May will again contrast the erotic and military when Caesar is called back to his duty and must handle the unruly Pharnaces and echoes the Hercules-Omphale simile as

46 See Spenser, *Fairie Queene* 5.5.24.

47 Cf. McCune (2014) 182–184.

he describes how Caesar's desire for Cleopatra is stronger than all the swords drawn against him (2.223–224).

Unlike his later counterpart in Antony, however, Caesar is not thoroughly subdued and bucks the historical trend and literary topos of being brought to complete ruin through his sexual indulgences. Like the Caesar of history and legend, undefeated until the Ides, this tryst is merely another adventure and another conquest. In the English version May redevelops Lucan's image of her as a near-miss for conquering Rome:

Nor were the Fates pleas'd that the wanton loue
Of Cleopatra should more helpfull proue
To Romes affaires, than all those iust-drawne swords,
Which once Thessalia, Libya now affords.⁴⁸

Cleopatra's subjugation of Caesar has delayed Rome's subjugation under him, a delay in the development of the historical narrative that May must now right. If anything, his escapade has been a favour to Rome, which would have just fallen sooner. Indeed, Caesar anticipates his withdrawal from Cleopatra during an early wonderment over the powers that control his desire and invokes Jove as precedence:

Let Jove my warrant be; whom powerful love
So oft has forc'd from Heaven; or let it prue
The Thunderers excuse to future times
That Caesar now partakes the Thunderers crimes.⁴⁹

*Jupiter exemplum mihi sit, quem saepe coëgit
Saevus Amor magno furtim descendere colo:
Vel potius nostra absolvant delicta Tonantem,
Caesareumque Jovi veniam det nomen amoris*

Supplementum 2.63–66

Just as Caesar can style himself after Jupiter in Lucan's *Bellum Civile*, so too Caesar can style himself another Jupiter, as wanton lover and randy get-about in May's *Continuations*.⁵⁰ May then emphasizes Caesar's swiftness and rapidity.

48 *A Continuation* (1630), sig. Dv.

49 *A Continuation* (1630), sig. C4v.

50 On Caesar as Jupiter in Lucan see Nix (2008) 281–294 and Fratantuono (2012) 19–20.

Lucan characterizes Caesar as *acer et indomitus* (1.146), which is metaphorically presented in the extended lightning simile that emphasizes the swiftness and unstable nature of Caesar (1.151–157). Building on his predecessor's image, May's Cleopatra conjectures at their parting: "Caesar in his love can be / As speedy as in warre and victory". After a kiss Caesar departs "swifter than lightning" to rout Pharnaces, who is "vanquish'd with a looke".⁵¹ And thus Caesar is restored to action and none the worse for his indulgence.

Conclusion

May inherited from the literary and historic presentations of Caesar's character considerable variety. Different settings showcase differing aspects of Caesar that are at times contradictory and not so easily reconciled: he is active yet passive, forgiving yet vengeful, generous yet acquisitive. In early modern England, Caesar could equally, and simultaneously, embody both military virtue as well as philandering vice, thanks in large part to the distillation and indexing of his notorieties in commonplace books, and other explementary writings. Caesar's exempla, thus, often "illustrate opposing ideas simultaneously".⁵² Delineating Caesar's character has been a formidable and nearly insuperable challenge for historians, poets, and scholars.⁵³ May follows Lucan in adapting the Aeneas-Dido armature to fashion a parodic episode between Caesar and Cleopatra that is critical of Caesar's affair with Cleopatra and his loitering in luxury in Egypt; however, May grafts Caesar's role as lover onto Virgil's characterization of Dido. This manoeuvre counters Lucan's more active and military presentation of Caesar. Repositioning Caesar as Dido, or Dido-like, as May has, gives play to Caesar's notorious sexual proclivities and excess in adultery, while also refitting the literary and historic convention of Cleopatra's threat to masculinity and power to subjugate. Apart from a non-committal reference to running around like a frightened girl (10.458–459), Lucan avoids overt suggestions of effeminacy and unmanliness in Caesar while he is at Alexandria. He is greedy and acquisitive, to be sure, but certainly not as given over to the same degree of effeminacy with which Antony is charged. May appears sensitive to the notion that Caesar is prime for weakness in Egypt and finds a way to develop in his *Continuations* a way to cast back to that and redevelop the episode. In some

⁵¹ *A Continuation* (1630), D3v.

⁵² Jensen (2012) 99.

⁵³ Cf. Walde (2006) 45–61.

ways, the second book is a clever parody of Lucan, and in others, a competitive revision that allows May to antagonize the presentation of characters and events that were all but exhausted.

Bibliography

- Adelman, J. (1973) *The Common Liar: An Essay on Antony and Cleopatra*. London.
- Ahl, F. (1976) *Lucan: An Introduction*. Ithaca.
- Ahl, F. (2007) *Virgil Aeneid*. Oxford.
- Asso, P. (ed.) (2011) *Brill's Companion to Lucan*. Leiden.
- Backhaus, B. (2005) *Das Supplementum Lucani von Thomas May: Einleitung, Edition, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Trier.
- Backhaus, B. (2009) "Cleopatra in Thomas May's *Supplementum Lucani*," in Walde (2009) 347–371.
- Basson, A. and Dominik, W. (eds.) (2003) *Literature, Art, History: Studies on Classical Antiquity and Tradition in Honour of W.J. Henderson*. Frankfurt.
- Berry, J. (1964) *A Critical Old-Spelling Edition of The Tragedy of Cleopatra, Queen of Egypt by Thomas May*, Ph.D. diss: Rice.
- Berti, E. (2000) *M. Annaei Lucani Bellum Civile Liber x*. Firenze.
- Bertman, S. (2000) "Cleopatra and Antony as Models for Dido and Aeneas," *EMC* 19: 395–398.
- Binns, J.W. (1990) *Intellectual Culture in Elizabethan and Jacobean England: The Latin Writings of the Age* (ARCA Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs, 24). Leeds.
- Bono, B. (1984) *Literary Transvaluation: From Vergilian Epic to Shakespearean Tragicomedy*. Berkeley.
- Bono, P. (2006) "Rewriting the Memory of a Queen: Dido, Cleopatra, Elizabeth I," *European Journal of English Studies* 10: 117–130.
- Bradner, L. (1966 [1940]) *Musae Anglicanae: A History of Anglo-Latin Poetry 1500–1925*. New York.
- Bruère, R.T. (1949) "The Latin and English Versions of Thomas May's *Supplementum Lucani*," *Classical Philology* 44: 145–163.
- Chester, A.G. (1932) *Thomas May: Man of Letters 1595–1650*. Philadelphia.
- Cliff, C. (1999) *Thomas May: The Changing Mind of Lucan's Translator*, Ph.D. diss: Yale.
- Fratantuono, L. (2012) *Madness Triumphant: A Reading of Lucan's Pharsalia*. Lanham.
- Galinsky, K. (2003) "Horace's Cleopatra and Virgil's Dido," in Basson and Dominik (eds.) (2003) 17–23.
- Hatchuel, S. (2011) *Shakespeare and the Caesar/Cleopatra Intertext: Sequel, Conflation, Remake*. Lanham.

- Jensen, F.C. (2012) *Reading the Roman Republic in Early Modern England*. Leiden.
- Keith, A.M. (2000) *Engendering Rome: Women in Latin Epic*. Cambridge.
- Masters, J. (1992) *Poetry and Civil War in Lucan's Bellum Civile*. Cambridge.
- McCune, B. "Lucan's *Militia Amoris*: Elegiac Expectations in the *Bellum Civile*," *Classical Journal* 109: 171–198.
- Nix, S. (2008) "Caesar as Jupiter in Lucan's *Bellum Civile*," *Classical Journal* 103: 281–294.
- Norbrook, D. (1999) *Writing the English Republic: Poetry, Rhetoric and Politics, 1627–1660*. Cambridge.
- Norbrook, D. (1993) "Lucan, Thomas May, and the Creation of a Republican Literary Culture," in Sharpe and Lake (2009) 45–66.
- Paleit, E. (2013) *War, Liberty, and Caesar: Responses to Lucan's Bellum Civile, ca. 1580–1650*. Oxford.
- Pease, A.S. (1935) *Publi Vergili Maronis Liber Quartus*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Phang, S. (2001) *The Marriage of Roman Soldiers (13 BC–AD 235): Law and Family in the Imperial Army*. Leiden.
- Poulter, E. (1786) *A Supplement to the Pharsalia of Lucan, translated from the Latin of Thomas May*. London.
- Putnam, M. (1995) *Virgil's Aeneid: Interpretation and Influence*. Chapel Hill and London.
- Rossi, A. (2005) "*Sine fine*: Caesar's Journey to Egypt and the End of Lucan's *Bellum Civile*," in Walde (2005) 237–260.
- Sharpe, K. and Lake, P. (eds.) (1993) *Culture and Politics in Early Stuart England*. Stanford.
- Stover, T. (2008) "Cato and the Intended Scope of Lucan's *Bellum Civile*," *Classical Quarterly* 58: 571–580.
- Tracy, J. (2011) "Internal Evidence for the Completeness of the *Bellum Civile*," in Asso (2011) 33–55.
- Walde, C. (ed.) (2005) *Lucan im 21. Jahrhundert*. Munich.
- Walde, C. (2006) "Caesar, Lucan's *Bellum Civile*, and their Reception," in Wyke (2006) 45–61.
- Walde, C. (ed.) (2009) *Lucan's Bellum Civile. Studien zum Spektrum seiner Rezeption von der Antike bis ins 19. Jahrhundert. Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium*, 78. Trier.
- Wood, A. (1813) *Athenæ oxonienses: An exact history of all the writers and bishops who have had their education in the University of Oxford*. 3rd ed. London.
- Wyke, M. (2002) *The Roman Mistress: Ancient and Modern Representations*. Oxford.
- Wyke, M. (ed.) (2006) *Julius Caesar in Western Culture*. Malden.
- Zwierlein, O. (1974) "Cäsar und Kleopatra bei Lucan und in späterer Dichtung," *Antike und Abendland* 20: 54–73.

Thomas Ross' Translation and Continuation of Silius Italicus' *Punica* in the English Restoration

Antony Augoustakis*

Virgil, Lucan, and Statius, to name just a few Latin epicists of the Augustan and post-Augustan age, enjoyed a continuous and at times well-documented transmission through the Middle Ages into the Renaissance.¹ The Flavian epic poet Silius Italicus produced the longest extant poem in Latin literature during the last decades of the first century CE (probably composed between 80 and 96).² The poem relates the struggle of the Romans against the Carthaginian army of Hannibal during the long Second Punic War (218–202 BCE), their defeats at the hands of the Carthaginian and the final victory of Scipio Africanus over Hannibal in the battle of Zama. Upon its rediscovery by Poggio Bracciolini, the papal secretary in 1417 during the Council of Constance (Constantia, modern Konstanz), Silius Italicus' *Punica* immediately received special attention by philologists and humanists alike,³ especially because of its value as a historical epic on the Second Punic War against Hannibal, in other words, as a versification of Livy's third decade in an unmistakably Virgilian manner, as it was thought.⁴ More than half a century ago, in his 1953 study on Silius Italicus' reception in England, Edward Bassett had demonstrated that in England, in particular, from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century, various authors from Sir Thomas Elyot

* I wish to thank the editor for his feedback and kind invitation to provide some reflections on Silius Italicus' continuator, Thomas Ross. A version of this paper was presented at the annual meeting of the Classical Association of the Middle West and South in Grand Rapids, MI (April 6, 2011).

1 See, for example, Comparetti (1997) and Wilson-Okamura (2010) for Virgil, D'Angelo (2011) and Hardie (2011) for Lucan, and for Statius the various studies on reception and translations by Braund (2015), Chaudhuri (2015), Edwards (2015), and Newlands (2015).

2 Biographical details and the overview of the question of chronology of the epic's composition are provided by Augoustakis (2010b).

3 "The fifteenth century was Silius' century of greatest popularity", Muecke (2010) 401 notes, followed by the eighteenth century (Bassett [1953]). On Silius' fortunes in the Italian Renaissance, see extensively Muecke (2010) and the new edition of Domizio Calderini's commentary by Muecke and Dunston (2011).

4 The reception of Silius across time is documented in von Albrecht (1964) 9–14 and most recently Dominik (2010).

to Milton, Addison, and Macaulay (but not Shakespeare) alluded to, and widely excerpted from, Silius' long poem on the exploits of the Romans against the cunning Carthaginian general.⁵

This chapter will look in detail at one of the English translations of Silius, one that includes a continuation of the Flavian poet's unfinished poem, which at least the translator, Thomas Ross, considered as incomplete and left unfinished at the end of the seventeenth book.⁶ As others have already studied in this volume, examples of a continuation of Classical Latin epic poems can be found in Maffeo Veggio's Latin sequel to Virgil's *Aeneid*, Thomas May's *Supplementum Lucani*, or Giovanni Battista Pio's Latin supplement to Valerius Flaccus' *Argonautica*.⁷ Of these three, Thomas May produced in English the *Continuation till the death of Julius Caesar* of Lucan's *Bellum Civile* (1630), which he then turned into Latin, the so-called *Supplementum Lucani* (a decade later in 1640), although the Latin *Supplementum* represents a thorough revision of the English poem, not a mere translation from the English *Continuation*. The translator, and in effect continuator, of Silius Italicus, Thomas Ross undertakes to render the Flavian poem into heroic couplets, even though as J.D. Duff, the Loeb translator of Silius, puts it "his versification is unpleasing" and "the rhyming heroic verse which he chose for his metre was still in its infancy: Dryden had not yet seriously taken it in hand."⁸ Thomas Ross' undertaking as the earliest translator of Silius into English, constitutes an important step in the literary history of the reception of the Silian text; his translation was followed by several others in English, French, and German, leading eventually to Duff's Loeb edition, which remains the most authoritative English translation today.⁹ This chapter will explore the literary value of Ross' *Continuation*: as we shall see, the *Continuation* represents a development and completion of the themes and

5 Bassett's study, though short, remains remarkably invaluable today: for example, his comments on Dryden's possible references to Silius deserve further research. See Daemen-de Gelder and Vander Motten (2008) 36–37 on the merits of Ross' translation ranked highly among others in the royalist exilic group (Denham, Abraham Cowley, Edward Sherburne).

6 In his study of Thomas May's continuation of Lucan, Bruère (1949) 145 criticizes Thomas Ross' continuation as inept, since Silius' poem ended where it should have: "such unity as Silius could compass was achieved with the triumph of Africanus, and no good is done by protracting the action until Hannibal's death."

7 On translations of Greek and Latin texts from 1550 to 1700, see Cummings and Gillespie (2009).

8 Duff (1934) xviii.

9 For H.W. Tytler's posthumously published translation in heroic couplets (1828), see Bassett (1953) 165–166.

characterization encountered in Silius' poem.¹⁰ In particular, I shall examine an episode in Book 1 of the *Continuation* featuring Imilce, the wife of Hannibal, who is for ever separated from her husband, as he is now fleeing the African continent, seeking refuge in Asia Minor at the end of the Second Punic War; and the final episode of the *Continuation* in Book 3, the death scene where Hannibal commits suicide.

The Courtier Thomas Ross and His Literary Enterprise

Thomas Ross (bap. 1620, d. 1675) was the Keeper of Charles II's libraries while the king was in exile on the European continent during the English Civil Wars ("Keeper of His Majesties' Libraries, and Groom of His most Honourable Privy-Chamber").¹¹ In a very brief note on the otherwise neglected Ross, C.A. Zimansky notes that the only important thing about Ross "was that he had once been tutor to the Duke of Monmouth [James Scott, the illegitimate son of Charles II by Lucy Walter¹²] and was suspected to have been the first to turn his pupil's thoughts toward the kingship."¹³ In 1661, when Ross was dismissed

10 Particularly illuminating are two recent studies of Thomas Ross, the poet and translator, Bond (2009) and von Contzen (2014). As Bond observes: "A proper study of Thomas Ross thus advances our understanding both of the history of translation and of a perplexing question of courtly intrigue, as well as of the broader relationship between literature and politics in the Restoration" (589). Von Contzen rightly observes: "[Ross'] continuation of the *Punica* ... is a remarkable instance of engagement with the classics in seventeenth-century England and deserves to be appreciated not only for its polished and elevated style and careful choice and arrangement of scenes, but also for its subtle reinterpretation of the classical material for a contemporary audience" (26).

11 From 1652, as successor to Dr. Patrick Young (1584–1652); see Daemen-de Gelder and Vander Motten (2008) 32–33. For further biographical details, see Lewin (2004): "His father was footman to the five-year-old Prince Charles in 1605 and then page of the bedchamber on Charles' accession ... Thomas was educated at Charterhouse School and Christ's College, Cambridge, graduating BA in 1642 ... While cataloguing some books for the king he petitioned for payment and was appointed keeper of the king's library at St James' Palace at £200 a year with lodgings in the palace." For his political career, see Scott (1907) and Underdown (1960).

12 See Daemen-de Gelder and Vander Motten (2004) and (2008) 33 and von Contzen (2014) 26: "Ross's influence on his protégé was quite substantial, climaxing in the so-called black box affair: Ross advanced the issuing of a marriage certificate between Charles II and James's mother in order to make James the legitimate heir to the throne."

13 Zimansky (1942) 443.

from the tutorship, he published his translation of, and supplement to, Silius Italicus' *Punica*, under the title, *The Second Punick war between Hannibal, and the Romanes: The whole 17 books, Englished from the Latine of Silius Italicus, with a continuation from the triumph of Scipio to the death of Hannibal*. The book was first printed in 1661, a year after the restoration of his patron to the throne, and the second edition appeared in 1672.¹⁴ As K. Daemen-de Gelder and J.-P. Vander Motten aptly demonstrate, Ross' translation is a royalist response to the English Civil Wars, as the author was an active participant in the intrigues plotted to restore the monarchy.¹⁵ Most importantly, in addition to his translation of the seventeen books of the *Punica*, Ross appends a *Continuation* in three books, taking the unfinished story by Silius down to the death of Hannibal. The first book is dedicated to the King,¹⁶ the second to the Duke of York, afterwards James II, and the third to the memory of the Duke of Gloucester. Critics have previously discussed the relevance of Ross' translation for Charles, since the Latin epic's heroes function as *exempla* for the king during the turmoil of the Restoration. As Daemen-de Gelder and Vander Motten observe, "whatever analogies with the Civil Wars the poem may have conjured up in the minds of readers *after* 1660, in 1657 it was by no means clear whether the Royalist side would share the fate of Carthage or ultimately emerge victorious, like Rome."¹⁷

14 Von Contzen (2014) 42 corrects Bond (2009) 590 on the appearance of the *Continuation* only in 1672. A year before the second edition, in 1671, there appeared a publication under the title *An Essay Upon the Third Punique War. Lib. 1 and 11: to which are added Theodosius' advice to his son and the phenix out of Claudian*, with the initials T.R., which have been assumed to represent Thomas Ross; see von Contzen (2014) 28–19. See Daemen-de Gelder and Vander Motten (2008) 34 n. 9 on this publication's relationship with the Third Anglo-Dutch War (1672–1674), in which Ross himself fought.

15 Daemen-de Gelder and Vander Motten (2008) 32 and Bond (2009).

16 Bond (2009) 595: "The translation of the *Punica*, Charles is told, will show him 'what unperishable Monuments Great Persons may build to themselves, in asserting their Country; and, that as Your Sacred Person is endowed with all those Virtues, that rendered the Valiant Hannibal famous, or Scipio a Conqueror: so, by the blessing of Heaven on Your Majesties's Designs, some happy Pen may have Matter to build you such another Monument for future Times.'" See Daemen-de Gelder and Vander Motten (2008) 35–36 on the "Epistle at Bruges, To His Sacred Majestie" (18 November 1657), explaining that the King was familiar with Livy's version but not with Silius' relationship with the Third Anglo-Dutch War (1672–1674), in which Ross himself fought. The Daemen-de Gelder and Vander Motten study is dedicated mostly to a discussion of the engravings and illustrations accompanying the translation, not its literary value.

17 Daemen-de Gelder and Vander Motten (2008) 35.

Charles then could be identified as either Scipio or Hannibal, the conqueror or the conquered,¹⁸ while Ross shares Silius' pronouncement that the Second Punic War and by extension the English Civil wars would determine the fate of the world: *quaesitumque diu, qua tandem poneret arce / terrarum Fortuna caput* (*Pun.* 1.7–8), translated by Ross as: "while Fortune long was doubtfull, where to place the Empire of the World."¹⁹

Ross' *Continuation* picks up at the end of Silius' seventeenth book of the *Punica*, where Scipio's triumph in Rome completes the poem with a foretaste of the future apotheosis awaiting the Roman general, who, as the true offspring of Jupiter himself, will eventually find a seat in Olympus next to the gods and Romulus/Quirinus (*Pun.* 17.629–654).²⁰ Silius had also recounted in *Punica* 17 Hannibal's rescue from the battle of Zama through Juno's intervention, who creates a phantom of Scipio that will lead Hannibal astray and off the battlefield (17.522–580); in the last scene before the Carthaginian general disappears from the poem, Hannibal vows to continue to haunt the Roman mothers' nightmares, as he threatens to return and finish off what he now abandons, namely destroy and burn down the city and the empire (17.597–617). Ross is obviously fascinated by Hannibal's return to Carthage, as described by Livy and other authors, and his subsequent exile for several years because of the Roman request for his surrender in 195 BCE, first in the court of the Syrian king, Antiochus III, and then in Bithynia in the court of Prusias I, where he finally

18 Daemen-de Gelder and Vander Motten (2008) 35: "Charles would have found the countless vignettes of martial prowess, heroic fortitude, and admirable statemanship, Carthaginian as well as Roman, with which the *Punica* abounded, truly inspiring and highly relevant to his own condition."

19 For Silius' Latin text I have used Delz's (1987) Teubner edition; my translations are modified from Duff's (1934) Loeb edition, unless indicated otherwise. For Thomas Ross, I have accessed the 1672 edition from *Early English Books Online*; I refer to the three books of the *Continuation* by arabic numeral and page number. Von Contzen (2014) 29–32 provides an outline of each of the three books of the *Continuation* (with her numbering of each book: Book 1 786 lines, Book 2 938 lines, and Book 3 728 lines).

20 Ross consults and uses various ancient sources that covered the events after the Second Punic War, like Polybius, Livy, Appian, in combination with other poetics sources that Silius had also used, like Homer or Ovid; see von Contzen (2014) 33 for a list ("Thereby he gives weight to the credibility of his *Continuation* and implicitly demonstrates that his depiction of the events, even though composed in poetic form, can withstand claims of historical accuracy"). In his marginalia, Ross explains the context here and there with brief references (a total of 62 notes).

committed suicide.²¹ The story of Hannibal certainly resonates also with the situation of Ross' patron: once an exile on the European continent, Charles II has now come back to London, where he is reinstated as the legitimate monarch in 1660, a year before the publication of Ross' *opus*, surely while Ross is at work on the translation and continuation of the *Punica*.

Ross' Continuation

Upon returning home, in the first book of the *Continuation*, and incited to war by his father Hamilcar's shade, Hannibal first consults the temple's priestess before heading home to his wife Imilce. The scene at the temple offers a neat supplement to the very beginning of the poem, where in *Punica* 1, Hasdrubal initiates the young Carthaginian to hate the Romans and take an oath that he will avenge their native pride whatever the cost might be (*Pun.* 1.81–139). The initiation scene takes place at Dido's temple, but the priestess is ultimately silenced by Juno, after she reveals only the events through Marcellus' death but not the conclusion of the war: *uenientia fata / scire ultra uetuit Iuno, fibraeque repente / conticuere. latent casus longique labores* ("then Juno forbade her to learn more of coming events, and the victims suddenly became dumb. The dangers and endless hardships were concealed", *Pun.* 1.137–139).²² Ross exploits the opportunity offered by Silius' opening scene to bring it to a conclusion in the very opening of his own *Continuation*. Here Hannibal returns to the site of his childhood: "where, when a Childe, his Father made him swear / The War" (*Cont.* 1, p. 14). Hannibal wishes to know "what yet remains by Me / To be pursu'd, and what the Fates decree" (*Cont.* 1, p. 14). The priestess is explicit this time about the upcoming events in Hannibal's life, namely the Roman demands:

For often We
Have of the Gods enquir'd concerning Thee,
Whose thread of Life is twisted with the Fate
Of Carthage, and in That her better State
Consists: and hence it is Imperious Rome
By her Embassadours, who, now, are come,

21 On the later career and exile of Hannibal, see Lancel (1998) 169–210 and Hoyos (2003) 179–211.

22 On this episode, see Ganiban (2010).

Will not so much for Massanissa plead,
 As joyn with Hanno, to obtain thy Head,
 Or cast Thee into Chains: therefore till Night
 Returns, be Wary, and prepare for Flight ...

ROSS, *Cont.* 1, p. 15

Ross continues Silius' selective narration of the events after the War and compresses his narrative to focus on the fortunes of Hannibal after the defeat at Zama. He exploits Silius' association of Hannibal's fate with the fate of his city, as we can glean from *Punica* 16 (*unum / Hannibalis sat nomen erat*, "the name of Hannibal was enough", *Pun.* 16.19) or *Punica* 17 (*stabat Carthago truncatis undique membris / uni innixa uiro, tantoque fragore ruentem / Hannibal absenti retinebat nomine molem*, "now that all her limbs were severed, Carthage depended entirely upon one man for support; and the great name of Hannibal, even in his absence, kept the edifice of her greatness from falling in utter ruin", *Pun.* 17.149–151).²³ Silius identifies Carthage with Hannibal and vice versa: the merging of the two is subtle, and Ross, a sensitive reader of the Silian text, further underscores this oneness here.

Following the priestess' advice, Hannibal returns home to meet his wife, Imilce:

Pensive with this Advice, strait Home He goes,
 And, ruminating on his Country's Woes,
 His Chamber enters, with a troubl'd Face;
 When, almost drown'd in Tears, to his Embrace
 Imilcè flies ...

ROSS, *Cont.* 1, p. 15

Ross fashions Imilce after Silius' portrait of the Carthaginian wife in *Punica* 3 and 4.²⁴ In *Punica* 3 (61–157), Imilce and Hannibal were separated, as the Carthaginian general sends his wife and baby son back to Carthage for safety reasons. In the opening lines of the *Punica* 3 episode, Hannibal is similarly distraught: at Gades, he is unable to understand the physical phenomena associated with the Straits of Gibraltar,²⁵ because he had other things in his

23 Further discussion is found in Augoustakis (2003).

24 The figure of Imilce is discussed in detail by Augoustakis (2010a) 198–213 with further bibliography.

25 See the analysis by Manolaraki (2010).

mind, Silius asserts (*haec propere spectata duci; nam multa fatigant. / curarum prima exercet subducere bello / consortem thalami paruumque sub ubere natum*, “Hannibal viewed these things in haste; for he had much to trouble him. His first anxiety was to remove from war the sharer of his bed and their little son, an infant at his mother’s breast”, *Pun.* 3.61–63). Then, in a speech that has been studied for its prophetic overtones, as well as for its overt criticism of the general’s martial temperament,²⁶ Imilce admonishes her husband not to pursue what would become, in her opinion, a destructive operation:

*i felix, i numinibus uotisque secundis
atque acies inter flagrantiaque arma relictæ
coniugis et nati curam seruare memento.
quippe nec Ausonios tantum nec tela nec ignes
nec quemquam horresco, qui se tibi conferret unus,
quantum te metuo. ruis ipsos alacer in enses
obiectasque caput telis. te nulla secundo
euentu satiat uirtus, tibi gloria soli
fine caret, credisque uiris ignobile letum
belligeris in pace mori. tremor implicat artus.*

Pun. 3.116–125

Go and prosper, go with favoring gods and prayers! And amid the battles and the blazing arms, remember to keep in mind the care for your wife whom you are leaving and for your child. For I fear neither the Romans nor the spears or the firebrands or anyone who might meet you in single combat, as much as I fear you. You rush fiercely right upon swords and you expose your head to missiles. No virtue satisfies you, not even on a successful occasion; you are the only one for whom glory lacks limits, and you consider it an inglorious end for soldiers to die in peace. Trembling takes hold of my limbs.

As has been observed, “the Carthaginian woman seems prescient of the outcome, the final defeat of Hannibal and the non-fulfillment of his wishes ... The series of negatives (*nulla, caret, ignobile*) that Imilce uses implies that the subsequent expedition may be ultimately ill-fated.”²⁷

²⁶ Augoustakis (2010a) 209–211.

²⁷ Augoustakis (2010a) 211 and n. 25.

In *Punica* 4, Imilce is re-employed by Silius in the final scene of the book (*Pun.* 4.763–829) to stop the sacrifice of her own son, a fulfilment of ancient Carthaginian rites, established when Dido came from Phoenicia to Africa and founded the new city (*Pun.* 4.765–767). After an impassioned plea (4.779–802), where Imilce is presented as a Maenad, the mother succeeds in having the matter postponed and finally resolved by Hannibal himself, who vows to sacrifice many Romans instead of his son (4.803–829). In a long speech, Imilce's apostrophe consists of ironic imperatives (4.787–788) addressed to Hannibal, whereby she underlines the futility of the war her husband has undertaken:

*io coniunx, quocumque in cardine mundi
bella moues, huc signa refer. uiolentior hic est,
hic hostis propior. tu nunc fortasse sub ipsis
urbis Dardaniae muris uibrantia tela
excipis intrepidus clipeo saeuamque coruscans
lampada Tarpeis infers incendia tectis.
interea tibi prima domus atque unica proles
heu gremio in patriae Stygias raptatur ad aras.
i nunc, Ausonios ferro populare penates
et uetitas molire uias. i, pacta resigna
per cunctos iurata deos. sic praemia reddit
Carthago et tales iam nunc tibi soluit honores.*

Pun. 4.779–790

O my husband, in whatever frontier of the world you are now stirring up war, bring your army back here. Here there is a more violent, a more pressing foe. Perhaps at this moment beneath the walls of the Dardanian city itself, you, fearless, receive the hurtling missiles with your shield; perhaps you are brandishing a dreadful torch and setting fire to the Tarpeian temple. Meanwhile, your first-born and only son, alas, is seized in the heart of his native country, for an infernal sacrifice. Go now, ravage the household gods of the Romans with your sword and march by ways forbidden to man. Go, break the treaty which all gods were called to witness. Such is the reward you get from Carthage, and such the honors she pays you now!

Imilce raises serious doubts concerning the value of Hannibal's efforts to save his country by implicitly criticizing his exploits: the series of imperatives (*i, populare, molire ... i, resigna*) lays emphasis on the questionable value of Hannibal's war against the Romans. She doubts the advantage that the war will have for his

own country and family in particular, since the Carthaginians themselves are unqualified to appreciate such enterprise.²⁸

When Hannibal returns to Carthage in *Punica* 17, Silius exclusively focuses on the final battle at Zama; we never see Imilce again. Thomas Ross exploits this gap by means of Imilce's reappearance in his *Continuation*; Silius' translator and continuator here emerges as a careful and subtle reader of Silian portraiture:

would my Hannibal now lend
A Pity to these Tears, Thou shouldn't no more
The Hand of Fortune try, which Thee before
In one day thrust from that great Height, to which
The Toil of seventeen Years ha rais'd Thee ...
... and, if thy Breast
With Thoughts of sworn Revenge be still possest,
(Since Fortune courts the Young, and Thou art now
In Years, to which She seldom doth allow
Her Smiles) derive thine Anger to thy Son,
Instruct him here, at Home, what's to be done
To perfect Thy Desires, and at thy Death,
Into his Breast, with thy Departing Breath,
Inspire (my Hannibal) thy mighty Spirit,
That so He may entirely Thee Inherit,
And live the Fear of Rome. But if Thou fly
From hence, and leave Us to the Cruelty
Of Our insulting Foes, Our Captiv'd Names
Will strait become the Talk of Romane Dames,
'Midst their Triumphal Feasts; or be in Scorn
Suppress'd, as if We never had been born.

ROSS, *Cont.* 1, pp. 16–17

Whereas in *Punica* 3 and 4 Imilce was questioning her husband's impetuous and foolish enterprise to cross the Alps and attack the all-powerful Roman empire, now in the *Continuation* Imilce tries to stop her husband but uses Hannibal's own arguments to persuade him, namely that his son should be the continuator of the war against the Romans and that his stay in Carthage will guarantee her freedom; otherwise she will end up a slave in some "Romane

28 Augoustakis (2010a) 206–207 and esp. 207: "in their inability to define the divine, the Carthaginians uphold values that run contrary to divine law and custom."

Dame's" retinue.²⁹ Ross' Imilce reimagines the initiation scene of *Punica* 1, with now Hannibal passing the torch of *ira et odium* against the Romans down to his son. In her speech, she repeat Hannibal's own claims in the *Punica*, first that his son will continue the war one day and that the Second Punic War will result in Carthaginian victory:

*at puer armorum et belli seruabitur heres.
spes, o nate, meae Tyriarumque unica rerum,
Hesperia minitante, salus, terraque fretoque
certare Aeneadis dum stabit uita memento.*

Pun. 4.814–817

But the boy will be spared as the heir of my career in war. You, my son, on whom rest my hopes, you, who are the only safeguard of the Carthaginian affairs against the threat of Italy, remember to fight against the Aeneadae both on land and sea, as long as you live.

This fatherly injunction is followed by the certainty that the upcoming slaughter at Lake Trasimene will substitute the son's sacrifice: Carthage will be sated by the Roman bloodshed instead.

At the same time, Ross' Imilce reverses Silius' Hannibal's claim that Imilce will enjoy the enslavement of the Tiber and of the Roman women, who will henceforth be subjected to her service:

*te quoque magna manent suscepti praemia belli;
dent modo se superi, Thybris tibi seruiet omnis
Iliacaeque nurus et diues Dardanus auri.*

Pun. 3.149–151

You too may look for great rewards from the war now begun: if only Heaven favors us, all Tiber and the Roman women and the Dardans, rich in gold, shall be at your feet.

Not only did the Carthaginians lose the war, but Hannibal's promises proved empty: Imilce and the other Carthaginian women are *de facto* subjected to

29 Cf. in Book 1 (pp. 9–11), the lament of the Carthaginian mothers when their sons are sent to Rome and in Book 2 (pp. 38–39), the lament of Roman women when the Romans find out the Carthaginians prepare for war.

the Romans and potentially could serve Roman matrons as their slaves. While Ross draws on the prophetic elements of Imilce's portrait in *Punica* 3 and 4, he presents Hannibal as an unremorseful, stubborn man who annuls the promises made in *Punica* 4, namely to hand down the power of *imperium* to his young son.

In his reply to Imilce's plea not to leave Carthage once again and subject his family to further woes and dangers, Hannibal replies by alluding to another famous episode from Silius' *Punica*, one that involves Regulus and his wife Marcia:

This, with a thousand Sighs, and all the Charms
Of Kisses, mix'd with Tears, between his Arms,
Speaking, She sinks: while, with that constant Face,
With which He entred, in a strict Embrace,
He holds Her up, and thus replies: "Thy Love
(My dear Imilcè) is so much above
The Value of my Life, and that I would all
Those Dangers stand, which can upon Me fall,
T' enjoy Thee here: But this our Enemies
Will not allow ...

... but they will something New
For Me invent. Whatever was by Us,
Before, Inflicted on their Regulus,
Will be esteem'd too Little; I shall be
In Parts divided through all Italy,
And feel, in each, a Death, and yet not all
Their Malice satiate, when to Minde they call
The Fun'ral of their Friends. But, that I may
Their Plots avoid, and keep a better Way
Still open to my Fall, I now must fly
M' Ingrateful Country or resolve to dy,
This Day, before thine Eyes: for in this Hand
Of Mine, alone, my Fate shall ever stand.
Nor shall the World believe, the Life, and Death
Of Hannibal depends upon the Breath
Of Rome." As this He spake, She stop'd the rest
With Kisses, and, reclining on his Brest
Her drooping Head (whilst Tears, like April-rain,
Into his Bosom flow, by Sighs again
Dry'd up) "Since so it is (said She) no more

Will I (my Hannibal) thy Stay implore.
 Go, and be Happy! may those Gods, who Thee,
 With such Severity, deny to Me,
 Protect Thee, when Alone: go, Happy! may
 Thy wish'd Return be speedy! But I Pray
 For what I cannot Hope; those Gods, who now
 Us separate (alass!) will not allow,
 That We should meet again." As from her Tongue
 These last Words fell, about his Neck She flung
 Her Arms, and, after many Kisses past,
 While both contended, who should give the Last,
 With a long Silence (for with Grief each Heart
 Too big for Language swell'd) at length they part.

ROSS, *Cont.* 1, pp. 17–18

Hannibal refers to a well-known passage from the *Punica* (the flash-back narrative of the First Punic War, inset in Book 6), where Regulus' deadly punishment involves his confinement in a coffin-like box, which is in turn pierced by swords that eventually cut him into pieces (*Pun.* 6.539–544). In addition, in *Punica* 6, Regulus shuns his wife Marcia as he is heading towards his Stoic martyrdom in Carthage (6.403–520).³⁰ Now Imilce appropriates a Marcia-eque moment from *Punica* 6, by drowning the rest of Hannibal's words with kisses; in Silius, it was the oars that drowned Marcia's last words to Regulus, as he stubbornly heads to Carthage to meet his demise: *ultima uox duras haec tunc penetrauit ad aures; / cetera percussi uetuerunt noscere remi* ("this then was the last sound that penetrated to those impervious ears; as for the rest, the oars, thrust in the water, prevented [him] from knowing", *Pun.* 6.519–520). As a worthy continuator of Silius, who had previously adopted the parting scene between husband and wife from Homer, Ovid, and Lucan,³¹ Ross now reimagines the parting of Hannibal and Imilce in terms that recall other scenes from the *Punica*. The couple then is separated in a description that emphasizes the physical contact between Hannibal and Imilce, as opposed to their earlier parting in *Punica* 3, where their gaze is emphasized more than their kissing:

30 On Regulus, the Stoic hero, as portrayed by Silius, and his wife, see Augoustakis (2010a) 156–195.

31 Augoustakis (2010a) 164 and n. 21.

*haerent intenti uultus et litora seruant,
donec iter liquidum uolucris rapiente carina
consumpsit uisus pontus tellusque recessit.*

Pun. 3.155–157

Their eyes cling to one another and watch the shore, until the sea made sight impossible and the land fell back, as the swift ship sped on its watery way.

As has been observed, “as Imilce is separated from Hannibal ... for a moment we are invited to visualize their parting, focalized from the perspective of both husband and wife, as their gaze remains fixed to one another, in this near cosmogonic event, where the *pontus* and the *tellus* are separated from each other, before we see the parting through Imilce’s own eyes, when, from the boat, she sees the land recede.”³² Ross re-appropriates the scene by making it modern and familiar to a seventeenth century audience: the kisses and bodily contact are followed by silence and finally the separation.

At midnight, Hannibal revisits the temple to find the priestess engaged in a mantic, chthonic ritual. The foreboding imagery of suicide is made clear straight away: the priestess wears a mantle with Dido’s suicide on it and holds a Stygian wand:

a Mantle cross her Breast,
In which forsaken Dido’s Death, exprest
By her fair Sister’s Hand, and there bequeath’d
As Sacred (with the Sword, She, Frantick, sheath’d
In her own Bosom) fastn’d by a Charm
On her left Shoulder, and her other Arm
Quite Naked, waving round a Stygian Wand,
With Which, by adding Words, She could command
The Pow’rs of Hell ...

ROSS, *Cont.* 1, pp. 18–19

Hannibal becomes the recipient of the prophecy that foretells of Scipio’s and Hannibal’s demise in the same year: “Scipio shall not more Fortunate at Rome / By th’ World be held, then Hannibal at Home. / One Year shall give a Period to their Breath, / And each finde Satisfaction in his Death” (Ross, *Cont.* 1, p. 19).

³² Augoustakis (2010a) 152.

In the second book of the *Continuation*, en route to Asia Minor, Hannibal is first told the unfortunate, tragic story of Syphax and Sophonisba by Isalces; Sophonisba, like Dido and Hannibal, commits suicide.³³ At Ephesus, Hannibal meets Scipio, and they enjoy a conversation during a banquet, in which the question of heroism comes up: who was the great general in the Second Punic War? The third book recounts the struggle of the Roman and Syrian sides: Juno infects the Romans with illness, while Venus causes the Syrian fleet's landing in Cyprus. The Asian forces are defeated, and Hannibal flees to the court of the King of Bithynia, where he commits suicide.

In the final episode of the *Continuation*, Ross ties several threads of the Silian narrative together: Hannibal's death had in fact been foreshadowed twice by Silius himself in the *Punica* (2.699–707; 13.874–893).³⁴ This is one of the reasons that leads Ross to the composition of a supplement that would take the poem down to its destined *telos*, namely the death of the Carthaginian general:

He's still so great, that none can Hannibal,
 But Hannibal, destroy. And, to prevent
 Surprize, into a secret place he went,
 Where, first the Gods accus'd, and Hanno's Pride,
 (That to his growing Conquests Aid deni'd)
 The Syrians Folly, and base Prusias last
 Perfidious Act (which all the rest surpast
 In Infamy) with Execrations blam'd,
 The Aid of his Great Father's Spirit he claim'd:
 And a dire Poison (without farther Pause)
 More Fierce then that, which, from the raging Jaws
 Of Cerberus, upon Earth's Bosom fell,
 When Great Alcides drag'd him chain'd from Hell,

33 Von Contzen (2014) analyses the episode in detail "as a creative poem in its own right and as a commentary to the political situation in England" (34): "Ross ... chose to rely predominantly on classical sources, Livy in particular, and changed the account considerably in Sophonisba's favor" (39); "Sophonisba's suicide is both a heroic and a 'royal' one. She dies a queen and has not forsaken her country, thereby repeating Syphax's steadfastness, which is equally 'royal' in its consequence. Rome and its republican leader Scipio cannot subdue the couple. Perhaps this royal rewriting of Sophonisba as well as Syphax transmits a message of solace: the Royalists may have lost England and the monarchy, but they can still be true to themselves and do not have to give in to the republican powers" (42).

34 Cf. Plb. 23.13.1–2, Nep. *Han.* 12.5, Liv. 39.51.1–12, Just. *Ep.* 32.4.8, Juv. 10.164, Plut. *Fam.* 20.1–11, App. *Syr.* 11, Zon. 9.21.7.

He swallows down. This baneful Drug, before
 Prepar'd by a Massylian Witch, he wore
 Lock'd on his Sword, which, if that chanc'd to fail,
 Might, as his surer Destiny, prevail
 Against all Humane Force: and, as he found
 It seiz'd his Vitals by an Inward Wound,
 He these last Words expir'd. Now lay aside
 Thy Fears (O Rome) no more will I thy Pride
 Oppose, but with this Satisfaction Dy,
 That, thus Degenerate, Thy self, wilt my
 Revenge effect. Not Arms, but Virtue made
 Thy Fathers Great; which since in Theee decai'd
 Thy Ruin must ensue. They, Nobly, scorn'd
 By Treason to destroy a Fo, and warn'd
 The Epirote of Poison, when he stood
 Arm'd at their Gates, and Triumph'd in their Blood.
 But Me, opprest with Fortune and my Years,
 Betrai'd a feeble Victim to thy Fears,
 A Cons'lar Legate forceth thus to fly
 From Life, 'gainst Laws of Hospitality,
 And a King's Faith. But this vile Stain (O Rome)
 More lasting, then thy Trophies, shall become:
 And, when thy Deeds in War, in future Time,
 The World shall read, thy Glories this one Crime
 Shall blast, and all account Thee from my Fall
 Unworthy such a Fo, as Hannibal.
 More He'd have said, but through his swelling Veins
 Death creeps, and binds in Adamantine Chains
 The Spirits of Life, which with this Language ends:
 His Soul to other Heroes Ghosts descends.

ROSS, *Cont.* 3, pp. 75–77

By drawing mainly on Livy's account of the Carthaginian's death by poison,³⁵ Ross also combines several Silian episodes to recreate the scene of Hannibal's

35 Liv. 39.51.9–11: *'liberemus' inquit 'diuturna cura populum Romanum, quando mortem senis exspectare longum censent. nec magnam nec memorabilem ex inermi proditoque Flaminius uictoriam feret. mores quidem populi Romani quantum mutauerint, uel hic dies argumento erit. horum patres Pyrrho regi, hosti armato, exercitum in Italia habenti, ut a ueneno*

death. First, the prophecy concerning Hannibal's demise is delivered by the poet himself, at the end of the siege of Saguntum, when Hannibal enters the city only to find the population dead by mass suicide:

*uagus exul in orbe
errabit toto patriis proiectus ab oris,
tergaque uertentem trepidans Carthago uidebit.
saepe Saguntinis somnos exterritus umbris
optabit cecidisse manu, ferroque negato
inuictus quondam Stygias bellator ad undas
deformata feret liuenti membra ueneno.*

Pun. 2.701–707

Banished from his native land he shall wander, an exile, over the whole earth; and terrified Carthage shall see him in full retreat. Often, startled in his sleep by the ghosts of Saguntum, he shall wish that he had fallen by his own hand; but the steel will be denied him, and the warrior once invincible in earlier years shall carry down to the waters of Styx a body disfigured and blackened by poison.

Then, the poet's prophetic wisdom resurfaces under the auspices of the Sibyl, who delivers to Scipio a prediction concerning Hannibal's future, hiding of course the truth that Scipio himself will die in exile the same year as his formidable foe:

*damnatusque doli, desertis coniuge fida
et dulci nato linquet Carthaginis arces*

caueret praedixerunt: hi legatum consularem, qui auctor esset Prusiae per scelus occidendi hospitibus, miserunt.' exsecratus deinde in caput regnumque Prusiae, et hospitales deos uiolatae ab eo fidei testes inuocans, poculum exhausit. hic uitae exitus fuit Hannibalis. ("Let us free the people of Rome from their lingering anxiety," he said, "since they find it too long a process to wait for an old man's death. But it is a victory neither great nor notable that Flaminius shall win over a man unarmed and the victim of treachery. Today will at least show how far the character of the Roman people has changed. These men's ancestors forewarned Pyrrhus, an enemy under arms with an army in Italy, to be on his guard against poison; but *these* have sent an ex-consul as an envoy to incite Prusias to the heinous act of murdering a guest.' Then, bringing down curses on Prusias' head and his kingdom, and calling upon the gods of hospitality to witness the king's breach of faith, he drained the cup. So ended the life of Hannibal", trans. Yardley).

*atque una profugus lustrabit caerulea puppe.
 hinc Cilicis Tauri saxosa cacumina uiset.
 pro! quanto leuius mortalibus aegra subire
 seruitia atque hiemes aestusque fugamque fretumque
 atque famem, quam posse mori! post Itala bella
 Assyrio famulus regi falsusque cupiti
 Ausoniae motus dubio petet aequora uelo,
 donec Prusiacas delatus segniter oras
 altera seruitia imbelli patietur in aeuo
 et latebram munus regni. perstantibus inde
 Aeneadis reddique sibi poscentibus hostem
 pocula furtiuo rapiet properata ueneno
 ac tandem terras longa formidine soluet.*

Pun. 13.879–893

Condemned as a traitor, he will leave his faithful wife and darling son behind him, abandon Carthage, and flee across the sea with a single ship. Next he will visit the rocky heights of Mount Taurus in Cilicia. Ah, how much easier men find it to bear cold and heat and hunger, bitter slavery and exile, and the perils of the sea, rather than face death! After the war in Italy he will serve a Syrian king, and, cheated of his hope to make war against Rome, he will put to sea with no certain destination, and at last drift idly to the land of Prusias, where, too old to fight any more, he will suffer a second slavery and find a hiding-place by the king's favor. At last, when Rome persists in demanding the surrender of her foe, in hasty stealth he will swallow a draught of poison, and free the world at last from a long-enduring dread.

Furthermore, Ross quite nicely appropriates Silius' employment of Hercules as a failed model for Hannibal: though the Carthaginian emulates Hannibal many a time in the *Punica* (e.g. by crossing the Alps), he ultimately fails to reach Hercules' apotheosis after death.³⁶ In the death scene, Hannibal's poison is compared to Cerberus' when he was dragged by Hercules to the upper world. The drug was prepared by a Massylian witch, like the Massylian priestess who first initiated Hannibal in the nocturnal ritual of *Punica* 1 or in the night meeting of *Continuation* 1. Finally, Hannibal's soul descends to Hades in the

36 On Hannibal and Hercules, see Tipping (2010) 51–106.

manner of so many other epic heroes before him, most notably Virgil's Turnus, whose shade descends to the Underworld indignant at the end of the *Aeneid*.³⁷

To be sure, Hannibal emerges as the "hero" of the Continuation, in the same way that he can be called a "hero" in Silius' *Punica*: as the Romans' arch-enemy, Hannibal dominates both poems. He is the driving force behind the narrative, and Ross' decision to continue Silius' "unfinished" poem resulted from a desire to relate the death of the Carthaginian, not the death of Scipio, which coincidentally occurred the same year. As has often been pointed out,³⁸ in Silius' Flavian poem there are many heroes: Fabius, Marcellus, Scipio, and Hannibal, with Scipio and Hannibal occupying the most prominent role. This lack of a single individual lies at the heart of Ross' own poem, the *Continuation*. There are moments when we connect with Hannibal, his personal tragedy, his effort to survive in a world where Roman domination was becoming increasingly felt in the Mediterranean and would ultimately prevail as world power.

Ross' oeuvre should be read in the context of seventeenth century European history. As Christopher Bond perceptively observes, "Ross's 1661 version of Silius is a thoroughly Royalist production. In both subject-matter and presentation, it declares the loyalty of the translator to his monarch and Ross's eagerness to continue to serve Charles II as a poet and courtier. It thus may be seen as part of a sub-genre of translations of Roman epic during the Commonwealth and in the early years of the Restoration which deplored the deposition of Charles I and anticipated or celebrated the coronation of his son."³⁹ I would like to conclude with some remarks on the significance of Ross' recreation of the end of the poem on the Second Punic War by expanding and elaborating the meeting scene between Hannibal and Imilce and the death of the general. In an *aetas Siliana*, such as it was in seventeenth century England, Ross exploits many scenes from Silius' *Punica* to speak directly to the restored king Charles II. In fact, it may not come as a surprise that in such scenes as the one examined, Ross criticizes Charles II, the *Merrie Monarch* as he was called,⁴⁰ who remained a bachelor and did not marry until 1662. Charles then married Catherine of Braganza, sister of the king of Portugal, who nevertheless bore no children, a year after the publication of the translation, even though the

37 Bond (2009) 594: "By offering the English Silius as his literary gift to Charles, Ross declared himself no less a loyal monarchist than Denham, Boys and Ogilby, but he cleverly sidestepped the clichéd and competitive arena of *Aeneid* translation in favour of a new and distinctive project."

38 See, for example, most recently Marks (2005) and Tipping (2010).

39 Bond (2009) 592.

40 Miller (1991) 95.

marriage terms had been discussed as early as 1660 upon Charles' return to the throne. Charles' childless marriage to the Portuguese Catherine was seen widely as an anti-Spanish move. Perhaps there is a connection between this marriage and the portrait of Hannibal's and Imilce's loving union in the *Continuation*; after all, Imilce comes from Spain, and in fact Silius traces her birth back to the city of Castulo in *Punica* 3 (97–107). Charles gained notoriety for the hedonism of his court, as well as for at least a dozen illegitimate children by various mistresses. By depicting a scene of tender conjugal love, as the one we have examined above, Thomas Ross exploits another aspect of Silius' *Punica*: the powerful females who emerge to defend and support or chastise their husbands' decisions are read side by side with the great Roman heroes of a glorious bygone era of the Republic. Scipio and Hannibal can perhaps serve as *exempla* for the restored king Charles II, and so should Hannibal's and Imilce's loving embrace in Ross' *Continuation*. Just as the vicissitudes of fortune may serve as an example of a very uncertain future ahead. But as Christopher Bond argues, "we may conclude from Ross's failure to succeed his Silius translation with any more works dedicated to the king that his ambition to become Charles' court-poet remained unfulfilled."⁴¹ And perhaps, so did the messages underlying his *magnum opus*, Silius' *Continuation*.

Bibliography

- Asso, P. (2011) *Brill's Companion to Lucan*. Leiden.
- Augoustakis, A. (2003) "*Rapit infidum victor caput*: Ekphrasis and Gender Role Reversal in Silius Italicus' *Punica* 15", in Thibodeau and Haskell (2003) 110–127.
- Augoustakis, A. (2010a) *Motherhood and the Other. Fashioning Female Power in Flavian Epic*. Oxford.
- Augoustakis, A. (2010b) "Introduction: Silius Italicus, A Flavian Poet", in Augoustakis (2010b) 1–23.
- Augoustakis, A. (ed.) (2010b) *Brill's Companion to Silius Italicus*. Leiden.
- Bassett, E.L. (1953) "Silius Italicus in England", *Classical Philology* 48: 155–168.
- Bond, C. (2009) "The Phoenix and the Prince: The Poetry of Thomas Ross and Literary Culture in the Court of Charles II", *The Review of English Studies* 60.246: 588–604.
- Braund, S.M. (2015) "Naturalizing Statius: Translations of the *Thebaid*", in Dominik and Newlands (2015).

41 Bond (2009) 596. Cf. also Hammond (1998) 146: "Royalist writers turned to the translation of Latin poetry as a way of making coded statements of their loyalty to the defeated cause."

- Bruère, R.T. (1949) "The Latin and English Versions of Thomas May's *Supplementum Lucani*", *Classical Philology* 44: 145–163.
- Chaudhuri, P. (2015) "The *Thebaid* in Renaissance Italian Epic: The Case for Capaneus", in Dominik and Newlands (2015) 527–542.
- Comparetti, D. (1997) *Virgil in the Middle Ages*. Princeton.
- Cummings, R. and Gillespie, S. (2009) "Translations from Greek and Latin Classics 1550–1700: A Revised Bibliography", *Translation and Literature* 18: 1–42.
- Daemen-de Gelder, K. and Vander Motten, J.-P. (2004) "A Copy as Immortal, as its Original: Thomas Ross' *Second Punick War* (London 1661 and 1672)", in van Dijkhuizen, Hoftijzer, Roding, and Smith (2004) 185–190.
- Daemen-de Gelder, K. and Vander Motten, J.-P. (2008) "Thomas Ross's *Second Punick War* (London 1661 and 1672): Royalist Panegyric and Artistic Collaboration in the Southern Netherlands", *Quaerendo* 38: 32–48.
- D'Angelo, E. (2011). "Lucan in Medieval Latin: A Survey of the Bibliography", in Asso (2011) 465–480.
- Delz, J. (ed.) (1987) *Silius Italicus, Punica*. Stuttgart.
- Dominik, W.J. (2010) "The Reception of Silius Italicus in Modern Scholarship", in Augoustakis (2010b) 425–447.
- Dominik, W.J., Newlands, C.E. and Gervais, K. (2015) *Brill's Companion to Statius*. Leiden.
- Duff, J.D. (trans.) (1934) *Silius Italicus: Punica*. Cambridge, MA.
- Edwards, R. (2015) "Medieval Statius: Belatedness and Authority", in Dominik and Newlands (2015) 497–511.
- Ganiban, R.T. (2010) "Virgil's Dido and the Heroism of Hannibal in Silius' *Punica*", in Augoustakis (2010b) 73–98.
- Hammond, P. (1998) "Classical Texts: Translations and Transformations", in Zwicker (1998) 143–161.
- Hardie, P.H. (2011) "Lucan in the English Renaissance", in Asso (2011) 491–506.
- Hoyos, D. (2003) *Hannibal's Dynasty: Power and Politics in the Western Mediterranean, 247–183 BC*. London.
- Lancel, S. (1998) *Hannibal*. Oxford.
- Lewin, P. (2004) "Ross, Thomas (*bap.* 1620, *d.* 1675)", in *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography*, Oxford (<http://www.oxforddnb.com>, accessed August 26, 2014).
- Marks, R. (2005) *From Republic to Empire: Scipio Africanus in the Punica of Silius Italicus*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Manolaraki, E. (2010) "Silius' Natural History: Tides in the *Punica*", in Augoustakis (2010b) 293–321.
- Miller, J. (1991) *Charles II*. London.
- Muecke, F. (2010) "Silius Italicus in the Italian Renaissance", in Augoustakis (2010b) 401–424.
- Muecke, F. and Dunston J. (eds) (2011) *Domizio Calderini: Commentary on Silius Italicus*. Geneva.

- Newlands, C.E. (2015) "The First English Translation of the *Thebaid*", in Dominik and Newlands (2015) 600–611.
- Ross, T. (1661 and 1672) *Second Punick War* (accessed from *Early English Books Online*).
- Scott, E. (1907) *The Travels of the King: Charles II in Germany and Flanders, 1654–1660*. London.
- Thibodeau P. and Haskell, H. (2003) *Being There Together: Essays in Honor of Michael C.J. Putnam on the Occasion of his Seventieth Birthday*. Minneapolis.
- Tipping, B. (2010) *Exemplary Epic: Silius Italicus' Punica*. Oxford.
- Underdown, D. (1960) *Royalist Conspiracy in England, 1649–1660*. New Haven.
- Von Albrecht, M. (1964) *Silius Italicus: Freiheit und Gebundenheit römischer Epik*. Amsterdam.
- Van Dijkhuizen, J.F., Hoftijzer, P., Roding, J. and Smith, P. (eds) (2004) *Living in Posterity: Essays in Honour of Bart Westerweel*. Hilversum.
- Von Contzen, E. (2014) "'I still retain the Empire of my Minde': Thomas Ross's *Continuation* of Silius Italicus (1661, 1672)", *Medievalia et Humanistica* 39: 25–46.
- Wilson-Okamura, D.S. (2010) *Virgil in the Renaissance*. Oxford.
- Yardley, J.C. (trans.) (2000) *Livy: The Dawn of the Roman Empire, Books 31–40*. Oxford.
- Zimansky, C.A. (1942) "The Literary Career of Thomas Ross", *Philological Quarterly* 21: 443–444.
- Zwicker, S.N. (1998) *The Cambridge Companion to English Literature, 1650–1740*. Cambridge.

Epic Scotland: Wilkie, Macpherson and Other Homeric Efforts

Kristin Lindfield-Ott

As Casey Dué points out, “in recent years a number of Homerists have approached the so-called Homeric Question by investigating Homer as author and ‘inventor’ of the poetic tradition that we know as the *Iliad*”, and “in the eighteenth century [...] scholars and translators, most notably Alexander Pope, understood the term invention quite differently, assessing the ‘genius’ of Homer in terms of ‘fire’ and ‘invention.’”¹ This essay seeks to situate a number of eighteenth-century Scottish epics—Hamilton’s *Wallace*, Wilkie’s *Epigoniad*, and Macpherson’s *Highlander* within an epic tradition that—some argue—had been largely discontinued in Britain by the mid-eighteenth century.² This essay will begin with some general remarks on epics and the state of epic writing in eighteenth-century Scotland. Its focus, however, lies on Hamilton, Wilkie and Macpherson, who—apart from the Ossianic Collections—have not received much critical attention.

The best-known Scottish epics are, perhaps, John Barbour’s *The Brus* and Blind Harry’s *Wallace*. *The Brus*, a long narrative poem written in the 1370s, tells the story of Robert the Bruce and Sir James (Black) Douglas during the Scottish Wars of Independence in the late thirteenth and early fourteenth centuries. In almost 14,000 octosyllabic “Inglis” lines the poem celebrates Robert I and Douglas as chivalric heroes, culminating in the burial of Bruce’s heart at Dunfermline Abbey. Its patriotic sentiments—most notably that “freedom is a noble thing!”—are often commented on by critics and historians alike, and Barbour is heralded as the most influential of the Early Scots writers. The *Wallace*, on the other hand, is a late fifteenth-century romance that commemorates William Wallace’s fight for freedom. It is, as Anne McKim calls it, a “verse biography”, and while its content is not strictly historical, the poem’s portrayal of Wallace has had a lasting impact.³ The poem was adapted (and modernized) by William Hamilton of Gilbertfield in 1722, and, although perhaps aesthetically unremarkable, the poem was credited by Robert Burns as having “poured

1 Dué (2006) 1.

2 Cf. Rubel (1978).

3 McKim (2003). As for its impact, Mel Gibson’s 1995 film *Braveheart* is based on the poem.

a Scottish prejudice in my veins which will boil along there till the flood-gates of life shut in eternal rest.”⁴ This patriotism is something we will encounter again in our later texts (as well as Hamilton’s version itself) in the main section of this essay.

As noted above, epic poetry became an increasingly unpopular mode in Scotland toward the mid-eighteenth century; by 1808 the *Annual Register* noted that “the epic poem, languishing under the piercing rays of science, has died a natural death. The last efforts in this way, at all respectable, are, the *Leonidas* of Glover, the *Henriade* of Voltaire, and Wilkie’s *Epigoniad*.”⁵ However, in the mid-eighteenth century the literati were keen to keep promoting epic poetry as the standard of writing in their essays on aesthetics and taste. While some critics have seen this as a political (as well as aesthetic) move, arguing that “to impose epic form on a contemporary society by imprisoning it in the safe distance of antiquity” might signal “a lingering desire to render the Highlands safe for ever”, there is a clearly defined aesthetic grounding in the resurgence of epic writing in the mid-eighteenth century.⁶ In this the literati looked to the classics (instead of their own medieval traditions), and with Thomas Blackwell’s publication of *An Enquiry into the Life and Writing of Homer* in 1735, discussions of epic writing quickly became subsumed into pre-Romantic ideas of genius and originality. David Hume, for example, considers epic writing in a number of his *Essays Moral, Political, and Literary*. In “Essay xx: Of Simplicity and Refinement in Writing” he notes that “excessive refinements”—“too much ornament”, that is—is not “agreeable [...] in the epic”, and in “Essay xxiii: Of the Standard of Taste” he suggests that “the persons introduced [...] in epic poetry, must be represented as reasoning, and thinking, and concluding, and acting, suitably to their character and circumstances.”⁷ And indeed, if we look to the continent we find Voltaire remarking in 1762 that “today it is from Scotland that we get rules of taste in all the arts, from epic poetry to gardening.”⁸ By the middle of the century Scotland had thus become the cradle not just of taste, but—

4 Ferguson et al. (1985) 1. 136. Similarly, Gavin Douglas’s middle-Scots translation of the *Aeneid* (the *Eneados*) was republished in 1710 as *Virgil’s Aeneis, Translated into Scottish Verse, by the Famous Gavin Douglas Bishop of Dunkeld*.

5 *Annual Register* 1808 (1810) 3.

6 Stafford (1996) 86–87.

7 Hume (1985) 192 and 240.

8 “C’est un effect admirable des progrès de l’esprit humain qu’aujourd’hui il nous vienne d’Écosse de règles de goût dans tous les arts, depuis le poème épique jusqu’au jardinage. L’esprit humain s’étend tous les jours, et nous ne devons pas désespérer bientôt des poétiques et des rhétoriques des îles Orcades”, Voltaire (1879) 161–162.

specifically—of epic poetry. By 1762, of course, James Macpherson's Ossianic Collections had taken Europe by storm, and while Wilkie's *Epigoniad* was less successful outside of Britain, its largely positive reception in Britain signalled a distinctly Scottish mid-century resurgence of epic writing.⁹

Voltaire had explored epic poetry earlier, and particularly in his 1727 *Essay upon the Epick Poetry of the European Nations*. Written in English, the essay argued that “the best modern Writers have mix'd the Taste of their Country, with that of the Ancients.”¹⁰ Both the *Epigoniad* and Macpherson's epics do this; the *Epigoniad* uses polished eighteenth-century heroic couplets to narrate the story of the Epigoni and their war against Thebes, while Macpherson brings the “ancients” to Scotland in both the Ossianic Collections and *The Highlander*. Additionally, *The Highlander* shares similarities with both the *Iliad* and the *Aeneid* (while, like the *Epigoniad*, harkening back to Pope's and Dryden's couplets). Voltaire went on to argue, in the section on Milton, that “every Language has its own particular Genius, flowing chiefly from the Genius of the Nation, and partly from its own Nature.” This anticipates Blackwell's *Enquiry*, which, of course, argued for the importance of circumstance and conditions for the production of art. And although Voltaire here focuses on language rather than content, he does admit a connection between national characteristics and linguistic, and poetic, qualities:

the Freedom of Society in France, and the Turns of the Phrases, which, as they admit of no Transposition, are the more perspicuous, qualify exceedingly the French tongue for Conversation. The former Roughness of the English Language, now improv'd into Strength and Energy, its Copiousness, its admitting of many Inversions, fit it for more sublime Performances. [...] To this happy Freedom, that the British Nation enjoys in every Thing, are owing many excellent poetical versions of the ancient Poets.¹¹

“Freedom” is the key here: freedom in society is linked to freedom in expression, and freedom in expression in turn to freedom to imitate, poeticize and produce “sublime Performances.” One might be tempted to read Wilkie's and Macpherson's mid-century epics as British Whiggish libertarian writings, but

9 It is worth pointing out that Wilkie and Ossian were seen as primitive bards by the literati. Cf. Stafford (1996) 87.

10 Voltaire (1727) 41.

11 Voltaire (1727) 122, 125.

their Scottishness, and their shared themes of war—disparate nation states united by common enemy (Wilkie) and heroic Scots triumphing over invading foes (Macpherson)—might suggest otherwise.

Hamilton

In 1722 William Hamilton of Gilbertfield published *A New Edition of the Life and Heroick Actions of the Renoun'd Sir William Wallace, General and Governour of Scotland*—an adaption and translation of Blind Harry's *The Actes and Deidis of the Illustre and Vallyeant Campioun Schir William Wallace* (c. 1477, manuscript 1488 [MS Advocates 19.2.2]). Harry's *Wallace* was one of the first books printed in Scotland, and between its initial publication and the Union in 1707 it remained hugely popular.¹² In modern literary criticism Hamilton is often overlooked; indeed, the few scholars that engage with him largely discuss him as a letter writer.¹³ Sergi Mainer, one of the recent scholars of the medieval original, calls Hamilton's version "adapted and translated to post-Reformation and eighteenth-century tastes", and Jeremy Smith notes Hamilton's translation as "a modernized version for a contemporary readership."¹⁴ Felicity Riddy engages with Hamilton's version in a national context, arguing not only that it was the one "read by both Burns and Wordsworth", and therefore of keen interest to Romantic-period writers interested in vernacular poetry and regional writing, but also links Hamilton's version to the Act of Union that formed the United Kingdom, and lost Scotland its independence: "the printing history suggests that the poem really took off after the union of the crowns [in 1707], when its bitter resentment at the loss of Scottish autonomy acquired a new contemporary resonance."¹⁵ This contemporary resonance has been questioned by Graeme Morton, who argues that the "authenticity of [the medieval] *Wallace* came from being labelled contemporary to its hero, executed in 1305", and that the later reworking in turn became "the basis of a shared memory" for Hamilton and his readers.¹⁶ In this Morton does not allow Hamilton's version contemporary relevance beyond ideas of shared cultural memory and the backwards-looking ethos that characterizes much of eighteenth-century Scottish culture,

12 King (1998) xi. King argues that Hamilton's edition "became the most commonly owned book in Scotland" (xi).

13 Cf., for example, Riach (2012); Shuttleton (2013).

14 Mainer (2010) 34; Smith (2010) 52.

15 Riddy (2007 [2012]), Kindle edition—no page numbers.

16 Morton (2012) 315.

but Riddy's argument is convincing: Hamilton's version, she writes, "taught its readers, in a period of the Anglicization of Scottish culture, how to feel Scottish."¹⁷

Hamilton's *Wallace*, seen in its own right rather than as merely a translation or adaption of the medieval original, is not just important in terms of Scottish politics or culture: reading it as a direct response to the Union of 1707 is, perhaps, a tad too simplistic, but similarly seeing it merely as an "update" of a medieval source text is also problematic. Indeed, ideas of origins, creativity and genius were one of the primary concerns of eighteenth-century aesthetics. Over the course of the century the role of the author changed significantly and the concept of originality and genius as the driving forces behind authorship gained prominence, and, while this is usually situated firmly in the middle of the century—in particular, Edward Young's *Conjectures of Original Composition* (1759) are usually cited as the turning point from *imitatio* to *creatio*—Daniel Cook has recently shown that ideas of originality and the "spirit of imitation" originated much earlier in the century, with Joseph Addison's *Spectator* essays from 1711 and 1712.¹⁸ As such we can view Hamilton's version as situated between these two spheres: it is clearly derivative and more than indebted to Harry's original, but it is also, through its updated language and use of heroic couplets, rendered not only modern but firmly original. As Hamilton notes on the title page, his edition has "the Old obsolete Words [...] rendered more Intelligible", and he has "adapted to the understanding of such who have not leisure to study the Meaning, and Import of such Phrases without the help of the glossary."¹⁹ He has not only modernized the work, as most critics claim, but he has *adapted* it. For example, the opening of the original reads

Our antecessowris that we auld of reide	[ancestors; should; read]
And hald in mynde that noble worth died,	[hold]
We lat ourslide through verray sleuthfulnes,	[bypass through very sloth]
And castis us ever till utter besynes. ²⁰	[turn ourselves to]

In Hamilton's version, this becomes

Of our ancestors, brave true ancient Scots,
Whose glorious scutcheons knew no bars nor blots;

17 Riddy (2007 [2012]), Kindle edition—no page numbers.

18 Cf. Cook (2013).

19 From the title page of the edition printed in Glasgow by William Duncan, 1722.

20 McKim (2003) 1.

But blood untainted circled every vein,
And ev'ry thing ignoble did disdain.²¹

The “brave true ancient Scots” are Hamilton’s, and all three adjectives have contemporary resonances that would be echoed by Macpherson’s Ossianic Collections in the 1760s. It is only in the second line that Hamilton follows Harry’s original—the third and fourth lines, again, resonate with ideas of purity, bravery and honour. Of course, those concepts are not new—they are found in the medieval version in abundance—but Hamilton places them at the outset of his poem. Similarly, Hamilton speaks to the reader a few lines later, saying that

Of such, I say, I’ll brag and vaunt so long
As I have pow’r to use my pen or tongue;
And sound their praises in such modern strain,
As suiteth best a Scot’s poetic vein.²²

Not only is there no such section in the original, but in the lines quoted above the modern editor has changed “Scots” to “Scot’s”, which certainly changes the meaning of those lines. In King’s version Hamilton (or his speaker) justifies his “modernization” as suiting “a Scot’s poetic vein”—that is, it suits the sensibilities of a Scottish readership and a Scottish author. In Hamilton’s version, however, the missing apostrophe could also signify a comment on the language used by Hamilton: the poem is in Scots, which ties in well with the author’s Preface, where Hamilton notes that his edition is in “modern *Scots*.”²³ Both readings tie in with Riddy’s interpretation, and Hamilton’s *Wallace* is thus an epic that both continues an earlier tradition, but one that also revitalizes that tradition.

Wilkie

Wilkie’s poem, published in 1757 to a mixed reception (though popular enough to warrant a second revised edition in 1759), has received scant critical attention.²⁴ It tells the story of the Epigoni, the sons of the Argive heroes known as the “Seven against Thebes”, who had fought and been killed in the first Theban

21 King (1998) 1.

22 King (1998) 1.

23 Hamilton (1772).

24 Cf. Stafford (1996) 86–88.

war. This war was the subject of the *Thebaid*, grouped, along with the anonymous (and lost) *Epigoni*, in the Theban Cycle, the four lost epics of ancient Greek literature.²⁵ The *Epigoni*, like their fathers, fought against Thebes, but unlike the first Theban war the Argives are successful and invade Thebes. The events of the *Epigoniad* are mentioned in the fourth book of the *Iliad*, where Sthenelus gives Agamemnon a short account of the sacking of Thebes.²⁶ There are no extant whole works that Wilkie could have used as source materials, and there are only a handful of surviving references to ancient versions of the story. Herodotus mentions Homer's *Epigoni* (but questions the authorship), while *The Contest of Homer and Hesiod* lists the 7000-line *Epigoni* as Homer's work, beginning with the line "But now, Muses, let us begin on the younger men."²⁷ Wilkie himself, in the Preface that preceded the first edition of the *Epigoniad*, says that the "story [of the poem] is taken from the accounts which we have of the heroic age", and admits to poetic license in adding the characters Agamemnon and Menelaus and omitting Sthenelus.²⁸

Wilkie prefaced *The Epigoniad* with a lengthy tract intended to situate his poem in the wider literary and aesthetic contexts of the period. The Preface serves two purposes: it allows Wilkie to formulate a sustained theory of genre and the relationship between antiquity and present, and it contains an apology and explanation of those parts of the poem that may evoke criticism in his contemporary readership.²⁹ Epic poetry, Wilkie argues, should "extend our ideas of human perfection, or, as the critics express it, to excite admiration."³⁰ This in

25 Cf. West (2003) 4.

26 In Pope's translation (IV. 454–465):

Not so fierce *Capaneus*' undaunted son,
Stern as his sire, the boaster thus begun.
What needs, O monarch, this invidious praise,
Our selves to lessen, while our sires you raise?
Dare to be just, *Atrides*! and confess
Our valour equal, tho' our fury less.
With fewer troops we storm'd the *Theban* wall,
And happier, saw the sev'nfold city fall.
In impious acts the guilty fathers dy'd;
The sons subdu'd, for heav'n was on their side.
Far more than heirs of all our parents fame,
Our glories darken their diminish'd name.

27 de Sélincourt (2003), 4.32 (p. 250); for *Contest*, see West (2003) 55.

28 Wilkie (1757) v and xl.

29 Wilkie (1757) xlii.

30 Wilkie (1757) vi.

done in several ways: through its “magnified” and heroic characters, through the universal manners it depicts, and through its subjects.³¹ The characters should be “accommodated, rather to our notions of heroic greatness, than to the real state of human nature”; this suggests a certain familiarity with epic poetry on the part of the reader, as without this they would struggle to align the characters in epic poetry with that heroic greatness.³² Universal manners “are those which arise from the original frame and constitution of the human nature, and which consequently are the same in all nations and periods of the world”—this accounts for the appeal for classical texts in modern, enlightened Scotland.³³ Finally, the subjects of epic poetry should be those “that have never been treated of by regular historians”—those, Wilkie argues, handed down by tradition only.³⁴ In this, Wilkie inadvertently aligns himself with history writing: if the subjects of epic have not been treated by *regular* historians, then surely the epic poet who bases their poem on them is an *irregular* historian, but a historian nonetheless. Indeed, by insisting on a subjects “taken from periods too early to fall within the reach of true history”—“those which are most remote from our own”—Wilkie actually attempts to forestall the political criticism levelled at him by both modern and contemporary commentators: that the ancient Greek society depicted in *The Epigoniad* is some sort of code for eighteenth-century Scotland, and that Wilkie himself is a sort of primitive poet.³⁵

In terms of genre theory, Wilkie distinguishes the epic from comedy and tragedy, arguing that epic poetry must contain a set of established “machinery”, consisting of “how heaven and hell must both of them be put in motion, and brought into the action; how events altogether out of the common road of human affairs, and no ways countenanced either by reason or experience, must be offered to men’s imaginations, so as to be admitted for true.”³⁶ This means that epic poetry should include the supernatural, both in terms of its divine apparatus and characters, and in terms of its inclusion of uncommon and unrealistic events and interventions. Unlike tragedy and comedy, which take their subjects from “true history” and “recent instances”, epic poetry “should be taken from tradition only”; that is, the subjects of epic poetry should be fictional

31 Wilkie (1757) iv, vi and vii.

32 Wilkie (1757) vi.

33 Wilkie (1757) iv–v.

34 Wilkie (1757) vii and xxxv.

35 Wilkie (1757) vi and viii.

36 Wilkie (1757) viii.

but believable.³⁷ Furthermore, epic poetry is distinguished by its recognizable “epic machinery”: “how heaven and hell must both of them be put in motion, and brought into the action; how events altogether out of the common road of human affairs, and no ways countenanced either by reason or experience, must be offered to men’s imaginations, so as to be admitted for true.”³⁸ Fiona Stafford has argued that the opening lines of the poem continue Wilkie’s remarks from the Preface on the “inferiority of the modern poet to Homer”, but this undervalues Wilkie’s intentions: “I now resume the strain”, he argues, “Not from proud hope and emulation vain, / By this attempt to merit equal praise / With worth heroic, born in happier days.”³⁹ Wilkie qualifies this intention a few lines later, noting that “love excites me, and desire to trace / his glorious steps, tho’ with unequal pace.”⁴⁰ The emphasis on inequality, however, is not as much about his disbelief in his own poetic abilities, but instead, perhaps, a reference to how long it had taken him to compose the poem, and to how little plot (in comparison to Homer) he covers in the poem.

Wilkie’s contemporary critics were quick to criticize the work. Although the poem “dazzled the Scottish reading public”, as Fiona Stafford puts it, others were quick to condemn the poem and its author.⁴¹ In July 1757, two months after the publication of the poem, the *Critical Review* published a damning review of Wilkie’s poem. It argued that the *Epigoniad* “resembles an epic poem in very little else but the outward form, and extent of it”, and criticizes Wilkie for omitting both a general plan and an argument for each chapter, something which evidently the contemporary reading public had come to expect of such productions.⁴² Furthermore, the review is upset at Wilkie’s “anachronistic” characters (particularly Agamemnon and Menelaus), and his portrayal of Diomedes as “weak and effeminate.”⁴³ The review also attacks Wilkie for straying from the model of the *Iliad* and including, for example, episodes reminiscent of “that kind of fiction which distinguishes the *Odyssey*.”⁴⁴ Of course, before the publication of Edward Young’s *Conjectures on Original Composition* in 1759 skilful imitation was ranked far higher than creative invention, though the older concept of *inventio* (as opposed to the Romantic model of *creatio*) involved the

37 Wilkie (1757) xiii.

38 Wilkie (1757) viii.

39 Wilkie (1757) I, ll. 21–24; Stafford (1996) 86.

40 Wilkie (1757) I, ll. 31–32.

41 Stafford (1996) 86.

42 *Critical Review* (1757) 28.

43 *Critical Review* (1757) 28.

44 *Critical Review* (1757) 30.

re-arranged creation of previously created material.⁴⁵ But the poem's style is also a source for contempt: it is, the review argues, "written in rhyme (if rhyme it may be called) and is in every part of it a poor and servile imitation of the great Homer, whose defects that author has faithfully copied, whilst the beauties of that divine writer have unluckily escaped him."⁴⁶

Two months later Oliver Goldsmith wrote a damning critique in the *Monthly Review* in September 1757, arguing that "The *Epigoniad* seems to be one of these *new old* performances; a work that would no more have pleased a peripatetic of the academic grove, than it will captivate the unlettered subscriber of one of our circulating libraries."⁴⁷ He also criticizes Wilkie's handling of his materials, examining his historical inaccuracies in details and concluding that Wilkie "has not only forsook, but contradicted [tradition], on almost every occasion; and given up the conduct of his poem to an invention barren of incidents, or at best productive of trifling ones."⁴⁸ Goldsmith was also keen to criticize Wilkie for his use of language: "our northern bard frequently seems, indeed, at some loss for a variety of language, which has led him into many disgusting repetitions."⁴⁹ Despite having only moved to London from Ireland the year before, Goldsmith's snide emphasis on "northern bard" displays a degree of anti-Scottish sentiment that sought to portray literary imperfections as a national affliction; not an uncommon display of the Scotophobia that characterized English attitudes to successful Scots after the Union of 1707 and the failed Jacobite risings of 1715 and 1745–1746, and particularly during the period of John Stuart, 3rd Earl of Bute's influence at court and as short-lived Prime Minister in the 1750s and '60s.⁵⁰ Overzealous, Goldsmith not only criticizes the poem as a "Scotch production", but also for its apparent disregard for Augustan diction, spotting a "notorious Londonism" that, he quibbles, mysteriously "found [its] way down to Scotland."⁵¹ He also condemns him for being "strongly attracted to Hibernian shores", that is, using Irish expressions.⁵² Goldsmith here not only mocks Wilkie's Scottishness, but at the same time attacks him for using *un-Scottish* (and unrefined) language.

45 Cf. Macfarlane (2007) 1.

46 *Critical Review* (1757) 28–29.

47 Goldsmith (1757) 228.

48 Goldsmith (1757) 228.

49 Goldsmith (1757) 233.

50 Cf., for example, Fielding (2008) 16 or Rothstein (1982) 63–78.

51 Goldsmith (1757) 233.

52 Goldsmith (1757) 233.

David Hume responded to the *Critical Review* piece (though not to Goldsmith's review) in September 1759. In a "Letter from Mr. Hume to the Author of the Critical Review, respecting Mr. Wilkie's Epigoniad", Hume displays both "surprise, and not a little uneasiness" at the hostile piece.⁵³ He points out the poem's success in Scotland, and emphasizes that while there are "a few mistakes in expression and prosody", Wilkie had never left Scotland; a response that answers Goldsmith's criticism more than that of the anonymous *Critical Review* writer.⁵⁴ Instead of criticizing Wilkie's mix of styles and sources, Hume praises him for his innovation: "The whole turn of this new poem would almost lead us to imagine, that the Scottish bard had found the lost manuscript of that father of poetry [Homer], and had made a faithful translation of it into English."⁵⁵ "Scottish bard" has, of course, different connotations from Goldsmith's "northern bard": it is less disparaging, and less oriented towards England and Englishness.⁵⁶ Hume's notion that innovation is something worth praising is echoed by the *Annual Register* in its 1808 article on Wilkie: "there is no one who does not admire the variegated harmony of Wilkie's versification, formed, it would appear, on the model of Milton's *Paradise Lost* or Thomson's *Seasons*; the splendour of the descriptions, and the wonderful powers and apparent facility with which he enters into the genius of the times of which he writes, and the very soul of Homer."⁵⁷ It is this sense of bringing to life the past that Hume also notes when he argues that Wilkie "has drawn a more exact and faithful copy of antiquity, and has made fewer sacrifices of truth to ornament" than writers that have glossed ancient models with sentimental finishes.⁵⁸

Macpherson

James Macpherson, the editor, translator and embellisher of the group of poems known as the "Ossianic Collections" is not generally thought of as an epic poet. While "Fingal" and "Temora", the titular poems of Macpherson's second and third collections of Ossianic works, are both self-proclaimed "ancient epic poems", supposedly written in the third century by Ossian the bard, they

53 Ritchie (1807) 420.

54 Ritchie (1807) 420 and 421.

55 Ritchie (1807) 422–423.

56 For discussions of North Britishness cf. Kidd (1996) 361–382; Colley (1992) 105–132; Rounce (2005) 20–43.

57 *Annual Register* (1808) 3.

58 Ritchie (1807) 433.

are very much presented as *Ossian's* epics, and not Macpherson's. The first Ossianic collection, the *Fragments of Ancient Poetry Collected in the Highlands of Scotland* are of a different genre altogether: they are *fragments*. In the "Preface" to the *Fragments*, written by Hugh Blair (though published anonymously), the fragments are presented as having been "originally episodes of a greater work which related to the wars of Fingal", "ascribed to the bards."⁵⁹ Even though the fragments are not explicitly advertised as *epic* fragments, the language here—"wars" and "bards"—belongs in the realm of epic, as does the mention of this "greater work" as a "heroic poem."⁶⁰ Indeed, the final three fragments are advertised as "obtained of this Epic poem."⁶¹ But not only were the Ossianic Collections sold as epics, they were also clearly perceived as epics by their audience. The *Critical Review's* article on *Fingal* notes that the poem will "be found a truly epic poem, and (under correction be it spoken) in many places superior even to Homer and Virgil." While subsequent readers have disagreed with this judgment, it is worth noting that Macpherson's epics are here compared to Homer and Virgil, when Homer alone was usually drawn up as the model for the Ossianic Collections.⁶² For the writer of the *Critical Review* article, *Fingal* is an epic poem primarily because "it celebrates and records the actions of heroes; as the subject is great, single and entire."⁶³ Similarly, the *Monthly Review's* article on *Temora* (vol. 28, 1763) Ossian is called "the Homer of the North", while the *London Chronicle* (vol. 13, 1763) points out that the poem "has all the grand essentials of the *epopæa*."⁶⁴

The Ossianic Collections, however, were not Macpherson's first foray into epic writing. In the 1750s, after returning to his native Ruthven after leaving Marischal College in Aberdeen, Macpherson wrote two epics: "The Hunter" (1756) and *The Highlander* (1758).⁶⁵ "The Hunter" was never published, and

59 Blair (1760); Blair admits to writing the Preface in a letter to Henry Mackenzie dated 1797, and reprinted in Mackenzie (1805).

60 Blair (1760).

61 Blair (1760).

62 This is usually followed by remarks about Macpherson's education at Aberdeen, where the curriculum was still much influenced by Thomas Blackwell's *An Enquiry into the Life and Writing of Homer* (1735).

63 *Critical Review* article (*Scots Magazine* (1761) 644).

64 *Monthly Review* (1763) 274, *London Chronicle* (1763) 196.

65 'The Hunter' was written in 1756–1757, and it only survives in Laing's edition of *The Poems of Ossian*. A couple of passages are dated November 1756. Laing prints the poem from a manuscript found by the Rev. John Anderson, the minister of Kingussie, after Macpherson's death. Sadly, this manuscript is now lost.

shares similarities with *The Highlander*, and has thus been seen as a draft version of the later poem.⁶⁶ The plot of “The Hunter” tells the story of Donald, a young orphaned highlander, who leaves the Highlands for Edinburgh, where an invading army is waiting to attack. He fights them off almost single-handedly, earning praise from the king and nobles. Eventually his true parentage is discovered: he is the son of a noble and thus able to marry Egidia, the king’s daughter. The poem ends with their union. While the poem thus undoubtedly shows epic overtones, its premise is one of romance: Donald does not leave his home because he wants to fight for his country, like, for example, Duffus in *The Highlander*—he only hears about the invasion after he has left—but because a fairy, whose faun he accidentally kills, instills ambition in him as revenge. This presentation of the poem as a literal fairy tale immediately establishes it as a romance epic, or an epic romance, like Spenser’s *Faerie Queene*.⁶⁷ Donald’s search for honour and glory, initially driven by the ambition that the fairy generated in him, is, in fact, a quest: as Barbara Fuchs points out, quests were traditionally made for love or adventure, and Donald’s combines both.⁶⁸ His quest begins as an adventure, but quickly, after he has proven his worth, turns to love and the pursuit of Egidia. Similarly, Donald’s (albeit unwitting) search for his origins can be seen as a quest.⁶⁹ Another romance element occurs in Canto VI, during the feast after the successful battle: the minstrel. More medieval than the Ossianic bard (and more English than Celtic), the unnamed minstrel in “The Hunter” sings not only of the exploits of heroes, but also tells stories of love and courtship. This is reflected by the poem as a whole: both war and love are present in “The Hunter”, but love plays a far greater role than it does in *The Highlander*, which is almost exclusively focused on war; there, love is almost just a side-line to the wider concerns of war and nationalism. In “The Hunter”, love is revealed as a force stronger than patriotism: “Love”, it is said, “only pleases; love

66 Cf. Stafford (1989) 61.

67 David Fairer points out that ‘the scholarship of John Upton (1707–1760) and Thomas Warton (1728–1790) in the 1750s effected a breakthrough in critical understanding of *The Faerie Queene*. Upton’s *Spenser’s Faerie Queene. A New Edition with a Glossary, And Notes explanatory and critical*, 2 vols (London: J. & R. Tonson, 1758 [actually 1759]) marked a great advance in establishing an authentic text and offered the earliest analysis of the historical allegory; and Warton’s *Observations on the Faerie Queene of Spenser* (London: R. & J. Dodsley, 1754), expanded to two volumes in 1762, revealed for the first time the full scope of Spenser’s sources, especially the poem’s kinship with medieval romance’ (Fairer (2000) 45).

68 Fuchs (2004) 4.

69 Fuchs (2004) 28.

alone shall pain: / Disturbed the mien of unaffected ease, / And all that native sweetness formed to please" (vi. 74–76). Unlike *The Highlander*, which closes with the hero as king, and his responsibilities divided between "a husband's care" and "Albion's rocks" (*Highlander* vi. 269, 271), the ending of "The Hunter" is only concerned with the love interest in the poem: the union of Donald and Egidia. This blend of epic and romance—if not its style or form—anticipates the Ossianic Collections.⁷⁰

The Highlander is an epic poem in heroic couplets in the vein of Pope and Dryden. It is set in the tenth century and tells the story of the Viking invasion of Scotland. Its main character Alpin, a simple Highlander, single-handedly defeats the Vikings. He falls in love with Culena, the daughter of the Scottish king, Indulph. Eventually Alpin is discovered to be the rightful heir to the throne, Duffus—Indulph's nephew. He marries Culena, Indulph dies, and Duffus is crowned king of Scotland. Despite the lack of critical attention, or indeed popular success, the poem is an important example of Macpherson's lifelong interest in history. In the poem Macpherson translates Scotland's factual past into neo-classic verse, and its originality lies in this. *The Highlander* is original because it is the earliest historical epic set in Scotland after the battle of Culloden in 1746 and as such is a founding text for the assertion of Scottish identity in a pro-Union British context. It is also original because of the way Macpherson refashioned history: the poem is simultaneously imitative and inventive. It imitates neo-classic epics, such as Pope's *Iliad* and Dryden's *Aeneid*, but its subject matter is inventive: history, not fiction. Its added layer of romance and pan-British nationalism sets it apart from the earlier epics. And it is original because it has traceable sources, a recognizable form, and a positive outlook. The prophecy in Canto v particularly emphasizes this: it heralds British glory for Scotland.

Hall has observed that "if his poems lack the consistency expected from historical documents [...] Macpherson achieves the coherent design expected from probable romantic fiction."⁷¹ Unlike the Ossianic Collections, *The Highlander* is foremost a history in verse, with only a few sentimental elements. Its very genre—epic—is symptomatic of this: while both the Ossianic Collections and *The Highlander* have been interpreted as an attempt to formulate, or recover, the Scottish epic, the Ossianic Collections have been successfully reinterpreted as romance. *The Highlander*, though, is a valid attempt to formulate an epic that was more historical than antiquarian: its sentimental conces-

70 Cf. Moore (2003).

71 Radcliffe (1998) 35.

sions, as Gerard Carruthers observes about the Ossianic Collections, are due to the period's need for "antique subject-matter collided with the predilections of the age of sensibility."⁷² Dafydd Moore has pointed out the treatment of vanquished foes in the Ossianic Collections as a symptom of this sensibility—something which can easily be extended to the earlier *Highlander*, as Duffus also refuses to take advantage of his enemy, Haco, throughout the poem. Of course, *The Highlander*, with its neo-classic form and emotional hero, is far removed from the grandeur and sublimity of the Ossianic Collections. Yet, like the Ossianic Collections (and, Carruthers would argue, like most Scottish literature of the age), *The Highlander* adapts older material and presents an idea of Scotland both ancient and contemporary.

The poem thus anticipates the Ossianic Collections as an attempt to (re-)write Scottish history, and to give Scotland an epic. Both in itself and seen together with the Ossianic Collections it is the earliest post-Culloden attempt to forge a Scottish epic from actual historic sources; an adaptation of history that is authenticated by the past. Indeed, as Alexander Macbain observed, *The Highlander* is "vigorously original in thought and expression."⁷³ In form *The Highlander* is a straightforward neo-classical epic poem, modelled on eighteenth-century translations of the classics. Pope's *Iliad* and Dryden's *Aeneid* are particularly relevant: Macpherson's poem derives parts of its plot and expressions from these epics. On closer inspection, however, this becomes no more than a mere shared framework of poetic conventions; its originality lies in its added layer of romance and British nationalism. *The Highlander* explores at least two of the themes of romance that Dafydd Moore sets out when he discusses the genre of the Ossianic Collections: the meaning of heroism, and the nature of sentiment.⁷⁴ While Macpherson's heroes—both Scottish and Danish—display many of the character traits and values that the classical heroes adhere to, he constructs them with a sentimental finish that anticipates both the Ossianic Collections and (Romantic) Men of Feeling. Duffus in particular is singled out as compassionate: throughout the poem he displays unexpected sympathy towards Haco, his Danish opponent. Twice he has the opportunity to kill him in nocturnal duels, and both times he is overcome by sentiments. The first time he "scorn'd to take advantage of the foe" (l. 238), he is rewarded by Haco's respect and, more materially, Haco's shield so that they can evade one another in the coming battle. The second time, Duffus is moved by

72 Carruthers (2001) 187.

73 Macbain (1887) 193.

74 Moore (2003) 84.

Haco's feelings for his bride, Aurelia, who followed Haco to the battle. Duffus' "feeling breast" is "touched" (III. 295) by a scene between the lovers he inadvertently witnesses, and he refrains from contending with Haco alone. While Duffus is not, of course, a knight in shining armour, on a quest to defeat a supernatural creature and to win the love of his lady, there are nonetheless elements of this in the poem. Canto IV is particularly relevant here: in it Duffus rescues Agnes, one of Culena's maids, from the unwanted advances of Corbred, which secures him not only the admiration of the Court and King Indulph, but also the love of Culena: "fair Culena feels a keener dart, / It pierc'd her breast and sunk into her heart" (IV. 87–88). The use of "fair" here and later in the canto is indicative of romance rather than epic, as is Duffus' description as "gallant youth" (IV. 81). In Canto IV we also find a staple of epic poetry: games.

Conclusion

In *The Mid-Eighteenth Century*, John Butt and Geoffrey Carnall claimed that "as for the 'classical' epic, the stubbornness of a Scot seemed now required to bring one to fruition."⁷⁵ As this essay has shown, the Scots indeed invigorated epic writing in the period. Hamilton, Wilkie and Macpherson all produced epics that were Scottish in language and content or, in the case of Wilkie and Macpherson, where the nationality of their author mattered a great deal to their reading public. Epics are ingrained in Scottish literature, from the earliest surviving Scots text Barbour's *Brus* and Gavin Douglas' *Eneados*, a translation of the *Aeneid* into Middle Scots (1513), to Robert Burns' "Tam O'Shanter" (1791) and twentieth-century efforts by Hugh MacDiarmid and Robert Garioch. Both MacDiarmid's "A Drunk Man Looks at the Thistle" (1926), and Garioch's "Sisyphus" (1960s), both written in synthetic Scots, have been seen as epics, as has Alasdair Gray's *Lanark* (1981).⁷⁶ As such the three epics discussed in the body of this essay are not the end-point of Scottish epic writing, but, perhaps, mark *one* revival of epic writing in Scotland.

75 Butt et al. (1979) 93.

76 For a discussion of the idea of epic in the Scottish Renaissance movement, see Riach (1991).

Bibliography

- Annual Register* 1808 (1810).
- Blair, H. (1760) "Preface", in Macpherson, J. (1760) *The Fragments of Ancient Poetry Collected in the Highlands of Scotland*. Edinburgh. iii–viii.
- Butt, J. and Carnall, G. (1979) *The Mid-Eighteenth Century*. Oxford.
- Carruthers, G. (2001) *The Invention of Scottish Literature During the Long Eighteenth Century*. Glasgow.
- Colley, L. (1992) *Britons: Forging the Nation, 1707–1837*. London.
- Cook, D. (2013) "On Genius and Authorship: Addison to Hazlitt", *The Review of English Studies* 64 (266): 610–629.
- Critical Review* 4 (1757), Art. VII.
- de Sélincourt, A. (2003) *Herodotus: The Histories*. London.
- Du  , C. (2006) "The Invention of Ossian", *Classics@3* (<http://chs.harvard.edu/wa/pageR?tn=ArticleWrapper&bdc=12&mn=1334>).
- Fairer, D. (2000) "Historical Criticism and the English Canon: A Spenserian Dispute in the 1750s", *Eighteenth-Century Life* 24: 43–64.
- Ferguson, J.d.L., and Roy, G.R. (eds) (1985) *The Letters of Robert Burns*. Oxford.
- Fielding, P. (2008) *Scotland and the Borders of Romanticism*. Cambridge.
- Fuchs, B. (2004) *Romance*. New York.
- Goldsmith, O. (1757) "The Epigoniad", *Critical Review* 17: 228–238.
- Hamilton, W. (1772) *A New Edition of the Life and Heroick Actions of the Renoun'd Sir William Wallace, General and Governour of Scotland*. Edinburgh.
- Hume, D. (1985) *Essays: Moral, Political and Literary*. Indianapolis.
- Kidd, C. (1996) "North Britishness and the Nature of Eighteenth-Century British Patriotisms", *The Historical Journal* 39: 361–382.
- King, E. (1998) "Introduction", in King, E. (ed.) (1998) *Blind Harry's Wallace*. Edinburgh. xi–xxx.
- London Chronicle* (1763).
- Macfarlane, R. (2007) *Original Copy: Plagiarism and Originality in Nineteenth-Century Literature*. Oxford.
- Mackenzie, H. (1805) *The Report of the Committee of the Highland Society of Scotland*. Edinburgh.
- Macpherson, J. (1758) *The Highlander*. Edinburgh.
- Macpherson, J. (1805) "The Hunter", in Laing, M. (ed.) *The Poetical Works of James Macpherson*. Edinburgh. 463–524.
- Macbain, A. (1887) "Macpherson's Ossian", *The Celtic Magazine* 127(12): 145–154, 193–201, 250–254.
- Mainer, S. (2010) "Introduction: Late Medieval Scotland and the Romance Tradition", *Scottish Cultural Review of Language and Literature* 14: 27–39.

- McKim, A. (2003) "The Wallace: Introduction", in McKim (2003) *The Wallace: Selections*. Kalamazoo. (<http://d.lib.rochester.edu/teams/text/mckim-wallace-introduction>).
- Monthly Review (1763).
- Moore, D. (2003) *Enlightenment and Romance in James Macpherson's The Poems of Ossian*. Farnham.
- Morton, G. (2012) "The Social Memory of Jane Porter and her *Scottish Chiefs*", *The Scottish History Review* 91(2): 311–335.
- Radcliffe, D. (1996) "Ancient Poetry and British Pastoral", in Gaskill, H. (ed.) *From Gaelic to Romantic: Ossianic Translations*. Amsterdam. 27–40.
- Riach, A. (1991) *Hugh MacDiarmid's Epic Poetry*. Edinburgh.
- Riach, A. (2012) "James K. Baxter and Robert Burns: the form of address", *JNZL: Journal of New Zealand Literature* 30: 53–73.
- Riddy, F. (2012) "Unmapping the Territory: Blind Harry's *Wallace*", in Cowan, E.J. (ed.) (2012) *The Wallace Book*. Edinburgh. 107–116.
- Ritchie, T.E. (1807) *An Account of the Life and Writing of David Hume, Esq.* London.
- Rothstein, E. (1982) "Scotophilia and 'Humphry Clinker': The Politics of Beggary, Bugs, and Buttocks", *University of Toronto Quarterly* 52(1): 63–78.
- Rounce, A. (2005) "Stuarts Without Edd: Wilkes, Churchill, and Anti-Scottishness", *Eighteenth-Century Life* 29: 20–43.
- Rubel, M. (1978) *Savage and Barbarian: Historical Attitudes in the Criticism of Homer and Ossian in Britain, 1760–1800*. Amsterdam.
- Scottish Magazine* (1761).
- Shuttleton, D.E. (2013) "'Nae Hottentots': Thomas Blacklock, Robert Burns and the Scottish Vernacular Revival", *Eighteenth-Century Life* 37(1): 21–50.
- Smith, J. (2010) "Textual Afterlives: Barbour's Bruce and Hary's Wallace", *Scottish Cultural Review of Language and Literature* 14: 37–69.
- Stafford, F. (1989) *The Sublime Savage: James Macpherson and the Poems of Ossian*. Edinburgh.
- Stafford, F. (1996) "Primitivism and the 'Primitive' Poet: A Cultural Context for Macpherson's Ossian", in Brown, T. (ed.) (1996) *Celticism*. Amsterdam. 79–96.
- Voltaire (1727) *An Essay upon the Civil Wars of France, Extracted from curious Manuscripts. And also upon the Epick Poetry of the European Nations from Homer down to Milton*. London.
- Voltaire (1879) *Oeuvres completes*. Paris.
- West, M.L. (2003) *Greek Epic Fragments*. Harvard.
- Wilkie, W. (1757) *The Epigoniad*. Edinburgh.

Virgil Mentor: Ursula Le Guin's *Lavinia*

Nickolas A. Haydock

And I remember, always, that I am contingent.

68



Ursula Le Guin's recent novel, *Lavinia* (2008), deserves serious critical attention as among the best of recent attempts to novelize ancient epic from an uncanny perspective. An Afterword to the novel thoughtfully characterizes its relationship to Virgil as a "translation" from epic to novel, as a "meditative interpretation" and "the unfolding of a hint" (274) dropped in the poet's sketchy presentation of the titular character. As we shall see, different sections of the novel relate to the *Aeneid* and its poet in different ways. The novel also deserves and perhaps even demands to be seen within the context of and as a contribution to the Virgil tradition.

There is a gateway of polished ivory through which authors have passed into the *Aeneid*, like shades into a dream. The gateway opened in 19 BCE in the port city Brindisi (ancient Brundisium) because Virgil died there, reportedly after consigning to the flames the scrolls of his epic poem. A distich from the first-century poet Sulpicius Apollinaris cited widely in early lives of the poet wittily compares the destruction of the *Aeneid* with the *iliupersis*:

Infelix gemino cecidit prope Pergamon igni,
Et paene est alio Troia cremate rogo.

Luckless Pergamum nearly fell in a second fire,
and Troy was almost consumed on another pyre.¹

The delicate metonymy (container for the contained) is densely nested with allusions. "Infelix" and "alio ... rogo" refer only by extension to Troy; they are, instead, oblique references to the tragedy of *infelix Dido*. Virgil's poem too is

¹ Text and translation from Ziolkowski and Putnam, eds. (2008) 423.

threatened like Latium with the fate of Troy, evoking the moment in Book 10 when Venus complains that the newborn walls of Troy are again at risk.² Octavian is supposed to have countermanded the last wishes of the poet and set Lucius Varius and Plotius Tucca to work editing the *Aeneid* for publication. Other than Homer's legendary blindness, this may be the single most influential biographical factoid in western literary history. The *Donatus Auctus*, a fifteenth-century version of the grammarian's fourth-century biography, has an eloquent adaptation of the story of what happened on Virgil's deathbed, September 22, 19 BCE:

When he [Virgil] realized that he was worsening with disease, he called often and with great insistence for his writing cases in order to burn the *Aeneid*. His requests were being refused, he directed in his will for it to be burned as an imperfect and incomplete thing; yet Tucca and Varus warned that Augustus would not hear of it. Then he consigned his writings to Varus and Tucca both, on the condition that they would not publish anything that had not been published by him himself, and that they would leave any unfinished verses (if there were any) as they were.³

The most striking of the changes this humanist biography makes to its source in the *Vita Suetonii vulgo Donatiana* is in the pejorative characterization of the state of the poem at Virgil's death *ut rem inemendatum imperfectamque*.⁴ Donatus had said nothing of the state of the manuscript or why Virgil wanted it burned. Many early readers, like many scholars today, assumed that Virgil referred to the incomplete half lines and that the wish to burn his text is emblematic of a poet obsessed with stylistic perfection. By the fifteenth century, Virgil's wish to destroy the poem has become a part of his will and the poem itself is described contemptuously "as an un-amended and incomplete thing."

The *Donatus Auctus* is contemporary with Maffeo Vegio's famous *Supplementum* to the *Aeneid* (1428), which frankly treats the poem as unfinished (rather than simply unrevised), and appends what the humanist culture of fifteenth-century Italy deemed a fitting conclusion. According to Craig Kallendorf, Vegio's poem attempts to resolve ethical tensions posed by the sympathetic representations of Dido and Turnus by eulogizing virtue and castigat-

2 This speech of Venus to Jupiter comes at 10. 17–62.

3 Ziolkowski and Putnam (2008) 361.

4 Ziolkowski and Putnam (2008) 349.

ing vice in frankly uncompromising terms.⁵ In Maffeo's version, the killing of a defenceless Turnus provokes none of the recrimination that has dogged the modern critical history of Virgil's poem. Instead, the Rutulian's fleeting spirit dispels the collective madness of the Latins, who curse their insane love of war: *et proelia damnant, / insanumque horrent optati Martis amorem* ("and [they] curse the conflict, shuddering at the crazed passion for Mars they once desired").⁶ At the end of the *Supplementum*, Aeneas' own dead body is cleansed of any mortal stain, and his soul apotheosized among the fixed stars by mother Venus (lines 623–630). In starkly disambiguating the moral complexities of Virgil's poem and its controversial ending, Maffeo in a sense authorizes exactly the kind of ethical reading of the poem that other Italian humanists were also endorsing. Though few modern readers would sign off on this interpretation of the poem, the idea that the work and especially its ending present ethical flaws that Virgil could and perhaps should have repaired still inspires both detractors and defenders of the poet.

Early attempts to authorize allegorical interpretations were made as well, beginning perhaps with Fulgentius, who conjured the spirit of Virgil to dictate a reading of the *Aeneid* as an allegory of the stages of human life from birth through adulthood:

Send me now the Mantuan Bard in person, so that I can lead his fugitive meanings into the light. And behold—he comes toward me well filled with a draught of the spring of Mt. Helicon. He is a proper image of a Bard with his tablets raised in order to treat his topic, and with a fixed frown murmurs some mysterious truth that wells up from within him.⁷

Virgil comes bearing all kinds of arcane knowledge, though Fulgentius poses as a timid pupil of the poet, able to handle only those mysteries that are easily reconciled with Christian beliefs. Still, the notion of Virgil's spirit returning to resolve or struggle anew with the enigmas of his poem has proved an enduring one. In part, this is what drives his appearance to Dante in the *Divine Comedy*, and, in the postmodern age, what drives Hermann Broch's masterful stream of consciousness novel, which follows the mind of the poet into his feverish last days in Brindisi through delirium and even beyond the brink of death.

⁵ Kallendorf (1989) 100–128.

⁶ Vegio (2004) 2–3 (lines 9–10).

⁷ Preminger, et al. eds. (1974) 330.

In Le Guin's fantasy classicism it is Lavinia herself, the stubborn facticity of her existence despite how little the poet had said about her, which persuades the wandering shade of Virgil that his poem remains unfinished. Lavinia also helps her husband Aeneas come to terms with that terrible last moment when, seemingly about to offer mercy to a kneeling Turnus, Aeneas sees the belt of Pallas and a mad rage bursts forth:

Stetit acer in armis
Aeneas uoluens oculos dextramque repressit;
et iam iamque magis cunctatam flectere sermo
coeperat, infelix umero cum apparuit alto
balteus et notis fulserunt cingula bullis
Pallantis pueri, uictum quem uulnere Turnus
strauerat atque umeris inimicum insigne gerebat.
Ille, oculis postquam saeui monimenta doloris
exuuiasque hausit, furiis accensus et ira
terribilis: "tunc hinc spoliis indute meorum
eripere mihi? Pallas te hoc uulnere, Pallas
immolat et poenam scelerato ex sanguine sumit."
Hoc dicens ferrum aduerso sub pectore condit
feruidus; ast illi soluuntur frigore membra
uitaque cum gemitu fugit indignata sub umbras.

VERG. *Aen.* 12. 938–952⁸

Aeneas stood, ferocious in armor;
his eyes were restless and he stayed his hand;
and as he hesitated, Turnus' words
began to move him more and more—until
high on the Latin's shoulder he made out
the luckless belt of Pallas, of the boy
whom Turnus had defeated, wounded, stretched
upon the battlefield, from whom he took
this fatal sign to wear upon his back
this girdle glittering with familiar studs.
And when his eyes drank in this plunder, this
Memorial of brutal grief, Aeneas,

8 All citations of Virgil, hereafter referenced with book and line numbers *infra*, are from Mynors, ed. (1969).

Aflame with rage—his wrath was terrible—
 Cried: "How can you who wear the spoils of my
 Dear comrade now escape me? It is Pallas
 Who strikes, who sacrifices you, who takes
 This payment from your shameless blood." Relentless,
 He sinks his sword into the chest of Turnus.
 His limbs fell slack with chill; and with a moan
 His life, resentful, fled to the Shades below.

trans. MANDELBAUM, 12. 1252–1271⁹

This passage remains an open wound in the western psyche. The language of human sacrifice would seem to strike at the core of the identity of *pious Aeneas*, but, as Rene Girard maintains, such sacrifices are at the origins of any social order, state or religious.¹⁰ What does it mean to "found" (*condit*) an empire with a sword in the chest of suppliant? Or do the exigencies of war and the greater good of making peace constitute a justifiable *state of exception* in Giorgio Agamben's terms?

Above we saw Maffeo's *Supplementum* shiftily transferring the *furor* from Aeneas to the Latins, whose madness is dispelled by the death of Turnus. Le Guin too wants to close the wound at the end of the *Aeneid*, but not before probing it thoroughly. Her Virgil is a "wraith" (38) whose spirit has fled a dying body on a boat to Brindisi and continues to wander, not least because his poem is incomplete:

I have been granted what few poets are granted. Maybe it's because I haven't finished the poem. So I can still live in it. Even while I die I can live in it. And you (Lavinia), you can live in it, be here—be here to talk to me even if I can't write.

51¹¹

A good deal of postmodernist fiction is built on such meta-fictional slippages into the worlds that books open up, but neither contain or circumscribe. Indeed, as is often the case in the Virgilian tradition, this anachronistic meeting between Lavinia and Virgil recalls an episode from the poem: the more tempest-

9 Translations of the *Aeneid* are from Mandelbaum (1971).

10 For instance, Girard (1977).

11 Le Guin (2008) 51. All further quotations are cited by page number *infra*.

tuous encounter of Dido and Aeneas, who likewise could never have met since they lived more than a hundred years apart.¹²

Like a tutelary spirit, Virgil gives Lavinia a short course on the poem as it exists, but encountering his hazily sketched heroine in the flesh has caused the poet to doubt his vaunted prophetic powers:

"No, I know very little. And what I thought I knew of you—what little I thought of at all—was stupid, conventional, unimagined. I thought you were a blond!" [...] In any case, how could one possibly end a story with a marriage?

"It's all wrong", he said. "I will tell them to burn it."

Whatever he meant, I did not like the sound of it. "And then look back from out at sea and see the great pyre flaming?" I said.

He gave his short laugh. "You have a cruel streak, Lavinia."

58

Her "cruel" jest comes straight from the Virgil tradition, specifically the lines from Sulpicius quoted above where the burning of the manuscript is compared to the sack of Troy and Dido's self-immolation seen by Aeneas from out at sea as he sails away from Carthage. Having met his heroine, Virgil also vets Maffeo's solution to the problem of the ending: concluding with a "marriage" rather than a "murder" (59) is risibly incongruous for the Iliadic half of his Homeric epic. Lavinia continues probing the poet's lacerating self-criticism as a kind of *Philosophia* consoling Boethius until Virgil admits that the ending is a sign of his own moral weakness, as well as his hero's: "I haven't the strength to go on. That's the trouble. I am weak. So the end will be cruel" (59). In the forest of Albunea, Virgil remembers leading another poet through a dark wood; now Lavinia—like a second Beatrice—will have to lead Virgil beyond the Limbo to which his own weakness has doomed him.

After she marries *pius Aeneas*, Lavinia attempts to talk her husband through the traumatic ending of the war and poem.

It was the ending of it that weighed on Aeneas: the manner of Turnus' death. To him, that put all the rest into question. He saw it as a murder. He saw himself as a murderer. He had withheld his sword, giving Turnus time to surrender to him fully and courageously, and yet after that, dismissing

12 See Desmond (1994) 1–22.

the obligation to spare the helpless and pardon the conquered, in a fury of vengeance he had killed him. He had done *nefas*, unspeakable wrong.

187

That the poet and his hero Aeneas are both allowed to expiate the *nefas* of the poem's ending already arguably constitutes a more satisfactory conclusion than the extant one. But in her eagerness to condole with Aeneas' post-traumatic stress Lavinia pushes him beyond regret to an *anagnorisis* of the limits of righteousness itself:

"It was a challenge to the death between you two. Nothing else could have ended the war. That is the order—the *fas* of war. Isn't it? And you obeyed it. You did what you had to do, what had to be done. As you always do!" [...] I thought he was struck by my argument. He was stricken by it. It was only much later that I saw I had taken from him the self-blame that allowed him some self-justification. If he could not see his battle rage as the enemy of his piety, as fury for a moment overcoming his better self, if he could not see his killing Turnus as a fatal instant of disorder, then he had to see the fury as part of his true nature, part of the right order of things, the order he had spent his life trying to uphold, serve, preserve. If that order held his killing Turnus to be a righteous act, was it, itself, righteous? Turnus' death ensured the victory of Aeneas' cause, but it was a mortal defeat for the man Aeneas.

189–190

To be clear: Virgil's poem, in my view, promotes such questionings of the violent nature of the sacred and the mutual implication of revenge and righteousness in the world it represents. But watching both the poet and Aeneas win through to these realizations after the heat of war has dissipated makes for a satisfying addendum to the epic, wherein the work and its critical history are allowed for a time to occupy the same imagined space and come to a reasoned, just accord.

Readers of fantasy fiction recognize that the genre's chronotope is not simply free invention; rather, it is composed of collisions and collusions of disparate spaces and times that interact in aesthetically pleasing and ethically provocative ways. In fantasy classicism or medievalism main characters and/or narrators typically focalize a perspective on the distant past designed to render its alterity open to our inspection without obliterating the exotic strangeness that attracted us in the first place. A fascinating example of how Lavinia's perspective makes the obscure legible for modern audiences comes in the early ekphrasis of Aeneas' shield. Almost indeed a tour de force employing intertex-

tuality as well as anamorphosis, Lavinia's word picture of the shield highlights, like its *Aeneid* intertext, the incomprehensibility of the images pictured there. In fact, it is unfortunate that Servius seems to have been mistaken in contending that the *clipei non ennarabile textum* (the indescribable texture of the shield, 8. 625) refers to the metalwork rather than the images. Non-narratable, the shield certainly is for Aeneas, because what he sees pictured there hasn't happened yet. He shoulders the fame and fates of his people all unknowingly (*ignarus*, 8. 730). Gransden cleverly suggests that, "For the implied Augustan reader, Aeneas' naïve and ignorant view is balanced by the eye of understanding, of recent memory, of delight in recognition."¹³

Le Guin's Aeneas is still in the dark about the images, even though the shield now decorates the hallway of the palace where he and Lavinia reside. But, perhaps not surprisingly, Lavinia sees things there that Aeneas cannot. Le Guin's text translates the recognitions of "implied" Augustans for implied Postmoderns. Just as Virgil's ekphrasis works as a transformation of the description of the shield of Achilles in Homer's *Iliad*, so too does Le Guin's version adapt W.H. Auden's blisteringly ironic poem, *The Shield of Achilles*. The situation described in the modern poem has Thetis viewing the shield over Hephaestus' shoulder. It stresses the shocking failure of the artwork to live up to expectations. There are no shining cities but "instead / An artificial wilderness / And a sky like lead", no "dancing-floor / But a weed-choked field":

The thin-lipped armorer,
Hephaestos, hobbled away,
Thetis of the shining breasts
Cried out in dismay
At what the god had wrought
To please her son, the strong
Iron-hearted man-slaying Achilles
Who would not live long.¹⁴

When Lavinia looks at Aeneas' shield, she finds depictions of the many wars still to come troubling and confusing; yet as she stares at the images, they undergo an anamorphosis, transforming from representations of the she-wolf and Sabine women, Actium and Augustus, to a more distant and more horrifying preview of history:

¹³ Gransden (1984) 96.

¹⁴ Auden (1991) 596–597.

As I continue looking I see things I never observed before. The city, or some great city, lies all in ruins, utterly destroyed and burned. I see another destroyed city, and another. Enormous fires burst out in a line, one after another, enveloping a whole countryside in flame. Huge machines of war crawl on the ground, or dive under the sea, or hurtle through the air. The earth itself burns in oily black clouds. Now an immense round cloud of destruction rises up over the sea at the end of the world. I know it is the end of the world. I say to Aeneas in horror, "Look, look!"

25

But of course he can't see it. This anamorphic shield only works its magic for immortals like Lavinia or for those moderns who cannot conceive of an apocalypse that does not include the mushroom clouds of nuclear war.

Lavinia's Odyssey

Iam matura uiro, iam plenis nubilis annis

Aen. 7.53



The novel includes no formal divisions, not even chapter numbers, although breaks are signalled by a space followed by a line in capital letters. Nevertheless, its structure may be neatly divided into three parts, which I will call "Lavinia's *Odyssey*", "Lavinia's *Iliad*", and "After Virgil" for reasons that will become clearer as the discussion unfolds. Additionally, brief flash-forwards are intercalated where Aeneas and Lavinia as husband and wife converse about the past, lending, along with oracles and fate, a determinism to all that occurs. The first part, "Lavinia's *Odyssey*" serves a prequel to the war in Latium as narrated in Books 7–12 of the *Aeneid*. It ends on page 95 with Lavinia watching as the Trojan ships sail into the mouth of the Tiber. In this sense, Le Guin's novel is distinctly Virgilian because of its intense investments in the imagery and structure of its source. As Virgil transformed the significance of Homeric lines, episodes, and structure, so too does Le Guin seek to create meaning and irony through varied repetitions. The shade of Virgil first appears to Lavinia across the altar of the Tiburtine Sibyl in Albunea, thus serving as a counterpart to the Cumean Sibyl that accompanies Aeneas in his descent into the under-

world. Virgil's first words, "What place is this?" (38), evoke Aeneas' meeting with Venus in *Aeneid* Book 1 (325–334). In the event, Lavinia turns out to be just as much the child of Virgil as Aeneas is of Venus. More importantly, a dramatic scene of misrecognition is played out, just as in the *Aeneid* where Aeneas fails at first to recognize his mother in disguise. In Le Guin, it is Virgil's halting *anagnorisis* that infuses the scene. He doesn't at first recognize the woman he wrote about so conventionally and sparsely as a virgin "ripe now for a man" and as the Lacanian sign of the phallus in Latium. As the poet repeats the phrase obsessively its tone transforms, like Virgilian phrases in the Centos, becoming almost a self-mocking reproach, a sign of his own failure to recognize the integrity of an abundantly rich life that belies his own flat invention.

Virgil himself is on a kind of Odyssean *nostos*, his body on a ship that has yet to arrive in Brundisium and his spirit wandering, seeking out his home in Rome, and finding it, though as it existed more than a thousand years before he lived—perhaps sometime in the twelfth century BCE. As Aeneas narrates portions of his history to Dido in Books 2–3 in the *Aeneid*, so too does Virgil narrate the Odyssean half of the *Aeneid* to Lavinia, with an important exception. We have for the most part only Lavinia's summaries of these performances. She remembers and records only what means most to her. The effect of these subjectively inflected summaries is analogous to Chaucer's *House of Fame*, which likewise reproduces the *Aeneid* albeit in an uneven form, which quotes particular lines and privileges certain favoured episodes, while omitting or passing rapidly over whole swaths of Virgil's original text. Chaucer's dreamer produces something like an image of late-medieval receptions of Virgil, where the treatment of the romance in Book 4 overwhelms the rest of the *Aeneid* and the final six books are summarized in a few lines.¹⁵ Lavinia's *Odyssey* is likewise a subjective reception of Virgil's first six books.

Lavinia reprises the Odyssean half of the *Aeneid* over the course of three instalments. In the first of these, adhering to what Servius called the *ordo naturalis*, she begins with a revealing *praeteritio*:

I cannot say here all he sang, about the great horse, and the snakes that came out of the sea, and the fall of the city. I will tell only what I have most thought about in the tale.

44–45

15 Haydock (2006).

A summary of Book 2 without the Trojan Horse or death of Laocoön or the sack of Troy seems woefully idiosyncratic. But what Lavinia passes over and what she ruminates on constitute a window into her heart and mind. She remembers things that have a personal salience for her: such as the omen of Ascanius' with his hair on fire (something she herself will experience); Aeneas' loss of his wife Creüsa in the chaos of Troy's last night; and his pathetic attempt to embrace her immaterial shade.

In the course of their second meeting, Lavinia asserts herself even more. She queries the poet about why, if Aeneas so loved and cherished his wife, he did not seek her out when he visited Hades. She also insists that the reluctant poet tell her about the love affair with Dido. Between them, poet and young woman adjudicate the question of Aeneas' culpability in Dido's suicide, a controversy that goes back at least to Ovid's *Heroides*. Lavinia finally delivers a verdict that betrays how hearing of Aeneas' adventures has engaged her sympathies: "I could not like this African queen but I could not possibly despise her. Yet suicide seems a coward's answer to betrayal. I said so" (56). Dido's despair continues to smoulder, perhaps because both the poet and girl are tied to her typologically. Lavinia, like Dido, is falling in love with Aeneas while hearing heart-wrenching stories about his past. While Virgil, remembering Dido's suicide, is falling further into despair and for the first time resolves to have the *Aeneid* burned.

As their conversation resumes the next day, the toll that recounting the plot of the *Aeneid* has taken on the poet becomes progressively evident. Having Virgil as a mentor figure allows him to fulfil his traditional role in guiding Lavinia into adulthood. In part, his purpose is to ready her for what is to come, just as Aeneas' journey to the underworld prepares him for what is to come. Virgil's visitations also recall his role in the *Divine Comedy*, where he serves as a guide to a revealed truth that the prophecies of the fourth eclogue darkly anticipated. But Lavinia's Virgil plunges deeper and deeper into despair, while Lavinia increasingly digs in her heels, rather than follow him. She witheringly rejects the assigning of dead infants to the bog-like hinterlands of Hades, calling it a "misinvention", "wrong", and, worse still, "*nefas*." Eventually, though, they reconcile and Virgil parts from her with revealing endearments, invoking Lavinia in significant terms: "My unfinished, my incomplete, my unfulfilled" (68).

Throughout these meetings the poet's voice and shade have been waning. The two have agreed that cruelty comes out of weakness. In their third and final meeting, Virgil's paraphrase of the last six books of the *Aeneid* functions as prophecy, just as does Aeneas' final vision of his progeny in Book 6. Yet the curtness of the summary only augments the unspeakable disgust it provokes.

Virgil begins with an anti-heroic outline of the realities of war: "Battles, sieges, slaughter, slave-taking, town burning, rape" (87). He then vomits forth a slew of carnage in vertiginous confusion—two pages of convulsive abjection of his poem and himself. The senseless violence has become a means to torment Lavinia: "I can tell you the war, Lavinia. Shall I?" He did not wait for my answer" (87). At the end he sadistically queries, "How do you like my poem now, Lavinia" (89). She cries as "he sang his hideous chant of slaughter" (89), but soon rallies, calling Virgil's hero and her future husband a "butcher." Both agree ultimately however that the final verdict on the poem will depend on how it ends. Though never stated outright, Lavinia herself is clearly the conclusion Virgil's unquiet spirit has been searching for, an ending that will save the text as allegorical readings once did. The poet's shade now begins to fade away completely. Lavinia tries to embrace it as Aeneas had the shade of Anchises in the underworld. Though she views the world of the poem from a privileged perspective, she also suffers its recursive pathos, its compulsive sublimity.

Lavinia's *Iliad*

The nobody that everybody was fighting about.

145



What might well be called the *other* Troy story begins as far as we know in the first century CE with two putatively eye-witness accounts of the Trojan War. These are admittedly partisan retellings. Dares Phrygius, who appears in the *Iliad* as a Trojan priest of Hephaestus, is the *nom de plume* taken by the author of *De Exidio Troiae Historia*; while the self-styled Dictys Cretensis, the supposed author of *Ephemeris de Historia Belli Troiani*, assumes the identity of a soldier who fought with the Cretan general Idomeneus. C.D. Benson offers a brief outline of this tradition:

We do not know the circumstances surrounding the creation of either. They are odd works, brief and crude, the unlikely progenitors of so numerous a race of medieval literary descendants. Although Dictys is a moralist and a patriot (he is bitterly scornful of the Trojan barbarians), both writers are of interest to us primarily because of their apparent factuality.

R.M. Frazer notes that “they use none of the divine machinery of epic poetry, and they tend to describe supernatural occurrences in rationalistic terms.” Both banish the gods from the fighting and instead provide character portraits, precise battle accounts, and other ritualistic details that convinced the Middle Ages that each was indeed a true history.¹⁶

While Le Guin's novel shares many characteristics with fantasy—of which she is a recognized master—it is perhaps in the tradition of Dares and Dictys that her work resonates most profoundly. The Olympic gods are missing from Lavinia's account of the war in Latium as well. Hers is also a first-person retelling of the war from the partisan perspective of a minor figure in Virgil's *Aeneid*. Yet Le Guin's approach differs too, and not only in its narrator being an eighteen year-old woman or in the inclusion of the poet Virgil as her mentor. Lavinia narrates the war in Latium from the distinctly personal perspective of someone who already knows how it ends but whose comprehension of things as they unfold is limited and obscure. She is, as she repeatedly insists in her best postmodern accent, “contingent” (4, 68). That personality should be revealed as a production of discourses, that we are born into and constructed by language, comes as no surprise to an intellectual culture steeped in Lacan and Foucault. Lavinia realizes that she exists in the form she takes because of Virgil. She lives on in the world created by Virgil's lines but the kind of anger this provokes is light years from what one usually encounters in works from Ovid's *Heroides* to Margaret Atwood's *Penelope*: “I am not the feminine voice you may have expected. Resentment is not what drives me to write my story. Anger, in part, perhaps. But not an easy anger. I long for justice, but I do not know what justice is” (68).¹⁷ In many ways, Lavinia is a female Aeneas, deeply committed to *pietas*, at the mercy of the fate established by Virgil's words, long-suffering, but resilient and pragmatic. And like Virgil's Aeneas, it is her moral development, her growth as an ethically self-aware human being that seems most to interest Le Guin.¹⁸

On the book jacket of the novel, Le Guin is celebrated for giving Virgil's silent heroine “a voice”—true enough, but there is an important source in

16 Benson (1980) 4.

17 For a comparison of these novels see, Miller (2010) and Brown (2012).

18 See Lindow (2009) 221: “Le Guin examines the moral development of Lavinia, a king's daughter living in early Roman times, but rather than writing history or mythology, Le Guin is most interested in the development of self-awareness, imagination, voice, and values—what moral psychologists like Carol Gilligan and Mary Field Belenky see as the basis of moral development.”

literary history for ending an adaptation of the *Aeneid* with a fuller treatment of Lavinia, one that Le Guin almost certainly knew. She received her M.A. from Columbia University in 1952 with a degree in medieval French literature and so would have been familiar with one of the earliest courtly romances: *Roman d'Eneas* (c. 1130–1140).¹⁹ The end of this retelling of the *Aeneid* includes a long section (approx. 1600 lines) focusing on “Lavine” and the vicissitudinous emotions of love. The two texts share a number of suspicious similarities, though Le Guin has never to my knowledge mentioned the medieval work as a source. First of all, the ending of the *Roman d'Eneas* focuses exclusively on Lavine, her shifting emotions, her doubts, fears and misapprehensions. It ends with her marriage to Aeneas. Remember that Le Guin's Virgil, who faintly remembers ushering Dante through the other world, had vacillated early on about concluding the epic with a “marriage” rather than a “murder” (59). Perhaps, Virgil has been reading the *Roman d'Eneas*. Undoubtedly Le Guin has. The focus on a young ingénue's dissonances in transferring her affections from one suitor to another play no part at all in the *Aeneid*, but this painful transformation is crucial to the *Eneas*, along with extensive internal dialogues during which the heroine interrogates and castigates her own feelings. Unlike Lavine, Lavinia doesn't fall in love at first sight; but fall in love she does, and like Lavine with a man she has only seen from afar. Le Guin also borrows from the *Eneas* the battle of wills between Lavine and Amata, a conflict about which the *Aeneid* is silent, but which plays a large role in the *chanson de geste*.

Amata is perhaps the most arresting character in Lavinia's *Iliad* (pages 95–175). We see the burdens she places on her religiously pious daughter. Lavinia in her own way battles her mother within the walls just as resolutely as Aeneas contends against Turnus without. As in the *Eneas*, the Amata of *Lavina* nourishes no serpent in her bosom, nor is there any Allecto to place it there; however, even in the absence of divine perturbation, she is volatile, mercurial, and a physical danger to her daughter. She kidnaps Lavinia and steals away into the mountains on the pretext of celebrating her people's version of a Bacchanal, which she calls the “Goat Feast, the Fig Feast” (105). Again, the difference of the episode from its source in the *Aeneid* consists chiefly in its being told from Lavinia's perspective, as she slowly moves from fearing her mother to pitying and transcending her. Amata has sent a message to Turnus and plans a wedding

19 Thanks to Tom Shippey (personal communication) for this element of Le Guin's biography.

in the mountains, which Lavinia terms “a mock wedding, a real rape” (109). This plays like the *Aeneid* with typologies, casting Lavinia as an unwilling Dido or Helen.

Another major revision of the *Aeneid*—and one every bit as constitutive of Le Guin's world—is the representation of women as playing a part in the war, not as a metaphor for the suspension of reason (like Amata) and not as gender-bending warriors (like Camilla), but as individuals who work and pray and suffer and survive behind the walls of Troy. Lavinia resists the Virgilian account in other ways as well. The Trojan ships constructed from the forest of the *Magna Mater* that Turnus sets alight in Book 9 are not transformed into sea nymphs; rather, the charred wreckage floats down the Tiber to Evander's kingdom, alarming Aeneas and hastening his return. The famous episode where Lavinia blushes while Amata professes her utter dependence on Turnus is closely repeated but with important differences that cancel an ambiguity in Virgil. In the original, it's far from clear *why* Lavinia blushes: at Turnus, who has determined to fight to the death for the right to marry her, or at Amata's frenzied appeal, or both. Whatever caused the blush, the result is the same: one look at Lavinia “drives Turnus wild” (trans. Mandelbaum 302). No such thing happens in the novel. Lavinia claims that she blushed in “shame” (159) at her mother's words and Turnus remains curiously unaffected by her craniofacial erythema. It's not difficult to understand why Lavinia should resist the implication that Turnus caused her blush or that it whipped him into a frenzy for the duel with Aeneas. It's also easy to see why she would dispute Virgil's claim that the Italians performed human sacrifice at the funeral of Pallas (144). Yet she quickly becomes entangled in her own logic: everything Virgil said is true—indeed, the world as she experiences it is a construction of his imagination—yet some of what he said is a barbarous fabrication. By foregrounding such conflicts of authority, Lavinia vitiates not only her own reliability but also Virgil's. She also makes a bid for a subjectivity that transcends Virgil's invention.

After Virgil: “Go on, go”

Uarium et mutabile semper femina

Aen. 4. 569–570



With the death of Turnus on page 175, Virgil's shade and his text cease to determine what ensues. What remain influential, however, are the seemingly hard-wired patterns of epic tradition: repetition, doubling, and vicious circularity. Amata is buried in the wedding gown she was weaving for Lavinia, and the Latins discover that every one of the suitors has perished in the final battle. The Gates of War are closed. They remain shut for three years until they fall open of their own accord. But there is progress too. Now the wife of Dido's lover, Queen Lavinia revisits the question of gender stereotypes so famously vetted in *Aeneid* 4 in more constructive ways:

Men call women faithless, changeable, and though they say it in jealousy of their own ever-threatened sexual honor, there is some truth in it. We can change our life, our being; no matter what our will is, we are changed. As the moon changes yet is one, so we are virgin, wife, mother, grandmother. For all their restlessness, men are who they are; once they put on the man's toga they will not change again; so they make a virtue of that rigidity and resist whatever might soften it and set them free.

184

Constructive, and no doubt congenial to some, but controversial nonetheless: Lavinia refuses to assume the attitudes one has come to expect of such heroines in historical fiction.

Yet there is a kind of gender reversal in the relationship of Aeneas and Lavinia. Whereas Aeneas once took his sense of purpose from oracles, prophecies, and visions, now it is Lavinia who knows the future, knows in fact that Aeneas is fated to die after only three years. She struggles with foreknowledge, just as he did. Right on cue, worshippers at the altar of Janus watch as the Gates of War slide open. The image is densely packed, even self-consciously meta-fictional. Le Guin's continuation deliberately looks back and forward at once. A debate between young Ascanius and *pater* Aeneas about virtue and piety stirs echoes of Achilles and Priam in Book 24 of the *Iliad*. Rutulian and Etruscan boys, disaffected and rebellious, foment rebellion in the borderlands. Aeneas goes to put down the revolt, has a youth on the ground and at the tip of his sword. He is asked for mercy, and, no doubt seizing the chance to right an old wrong, grants it. As Aeneas walks away, the boy runs him through with a spear from behind. Is this tragic history repeated as farce, or does it represent the novel's final commentary on the righteousness of justifiable force? In his conversation earlier with Ascanius, Aeneas had failed to resolve the contradictions inherent in the demands of *virtus* and *pietas*. His death while replaying the last scene in the *Aeneid* speaks volumes—the two are irreconcilable.

When Ascanius assumes the throne, he too is swept up into *uncanny* patterns of repetition. Doubling Achilles, he plays out a rather tawdry scene of inconsolable grief at the death of his companion and lover Atys. His sibling rivalry with his half brother Silvius and the fractious question about who should rule puts the younger boy in jeopardy. Lavinia finds herself playing the role of her mother Amata, who had tried desperately to keep her child from Aeneas. She steals away into the forest with the boy and desperately works to keep him out of the hands of his brother. Mother and son make their way back to where the novel began in the sacred woods of Albunea:

I saw Aeneas' shield very clearly for an instant, the turn of the she-wolf's head to her bright flank. I felt myself lying on a vault like a turtle's shell of earth and stone that arched over a great dark hollow. Below me lay a vast landscape of shadows, forests of shadowy trees. Out beyond those trees I saw my son standing in dim sunlight on the bank of a river, a river wider than Tiber, so broad and misty I could not clearly see the other shore. Silvius was a man of nineteen or twenty. He was leaning on Aeneas' great spear and he looked as Aeneas must have looked when he was young. There were multitudes of people all up and down the endless grassy bank. The grass was shadowy grey, not green. A voice near me, by my ear, an old man's voice, was speaking softly: "... your last child, whom your wife Lavinia will bring up in the woods, a king, a father of kings." Then I had so strong a sense of my husband's presence, his physical body and being, with me, in me, as if I were he, that I woke and found myself sitting up, bewildered, in the dark, bereft.

253

The anamorphic shield is at work again. In a sublime transformation the microcosm becomes macrocosm, as Lavinia feels herself resting upon the shield and viewing the world from within it. Of course she is seeing her son *as he will be* in a vision of her husband *as he was* when he stood upon the shores of the river Styx. She overhears not her husband's voice but Virgil's pointing out the soul of Silvius preparing to waken into the world. The voice speaks in and outside of time to the living and the dead. To Aeneas, certainly, but to that Aeneas who lives on within Lavinia, who is herself a creation of that voice.

Bibliography

- Agamben, G. (2005) *State of Exception*. Trans. K. Attell. Chicago.
- Auden, W.H. (1991) *Collected Poems*. New York.
- Benson, C.D. (1980) *The History of Troy in Middle English Literature*. Woodbridge.
- Brown, Sarah Annes (2012) "Science Fiction and Classical Reception in Contemporary Women's Writing". *Classical Receptions Journal* 4.2: 209–223.
- Desmond, M. (1994) *Reading Dido: Gender, Textuality and the Medieval Aeneid*. Minneapolis.
- Girard, R. (1977) *Violence and the Sacred*. Trans. P. Gregory. Baltimore.
- Gransden, K.W. (1984) *Virgil's Iliad: An Essay on Epic Narrative*. Cambridge.
- Haydock, N. (2006) "False and Sooth Compounded in Caxton's Ending to Chaucer's *House of Fame*". *Atenea* 26.2: 107–129.
- Kallendorf, C. (1989) *In Praise of Aeneas: Virgil and Epideictic Rhetoric in the Early Italian Renaissance*. Hanover.
- Le Guin, Ursula (2008) *Lavinia: A Novel*. New York.
- Lindow, S.J. (2008) "Lavinia: A Woman Re-invents Herself in Fact and/or Fiction". *Journal of the Fantastic in the Arts* 20.2: 221–237.
- Mandelbaum, A. (1971) *The Aeneid of Virgil*. New York.
- Miller, T.S. (2010) "Myth-Remaking in the Shadow of Virgil: The Captive(-ated) Voice of Ursula K. Le Guin's *Lavinia*". *Mythlore* 29.1–2: 29–50.
- Mynors, R.A.B. (ed.) (1969) *P. Vergili Maronis: Opera*. Oxford.
- Preminger, A., O.B. Hardison and K. Kerrane (1974) *Classical and Medieval Literary Criticism: Translations and Interpretations*. New York.
- Vegio, Mafeo (2004) *Maffeo Vegio: Short Epics*. M.C.J. Putnam (ed. and trans.) Cambridge, MA.
- Ziolkowski, J.M. and M. Putnam (eds) (2008) *The Virgilian Tradition: The First Fifteen Hundred Years*. New Haven.

Index

- Absyrtus 296–297, 301, 303–304, 306, 308, 309–311, 313
- Achilles 9, 11–12, 14–17, 19–24, 27, 35–39, 42–43, 46–47, 53, 55–61, 74, 77–81, 83, 93, 100–105, 119–120, 123, 128, 221, 231–236, 238, 249, 262–263, 284, 382, 391
- acrostic 33, 36, 136
- Actium 45, 320, 382
- Addison, Joseph 336, 361
- Adorno, Theodor 3, 199
- Aeneas 42–44, 48, 60, 98, 120, 149, 154, 157, 158–161, 168, 172–173, 229, 231–232, 234, 236–238, 240–241, 248–249, 250–255, 257–263, 269n8, 272–283, 286–290, 295, 296, 309, 317, 320, 323–324, 327–328, 377–391
- Aeneid* 1, 4, 32, 44n41, 47, 49, 154, 157, 160–162, 228–232, 236–241, 243, 249, 250–255, 259, 261, 263, 267–279, 282, 286, 290, 297, 327–328, 336, 353, 359, 372, 375–377, 382, 384–385, 387–390
- Aeschylus 58n35, 107
- Agamemnon 9, 12, 13, 15–22, 24, 25, 27, 35–39, 43, 47, 57–58, 82, 107, 147, 211, 213, 215, 221, 363
- Agathias 52
- Ajax 9, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19–20, 24, 55, 60, 71, 100, 101, 147, 149
- Alcinous 65, 219, 307
- Alexander the Great 129, 258, 263, 318, 320, 324
- Alexandreis* 124n42, 125
- allegory 2, 79, 90, 93, 96–97, 101, 103, 279–280, 369n67, 377, 386
- Amazons 55, 99, 101, 105, 107
- Anastasius I, emperor 61
- Anchises 161, 236–238, 255, 257, 276, 386
- Andromache 12, 13, 38, 41–42, 48, 100, 104, 127, 252
- Anna 227, 244, 259, 261
- annexation, literary 253
- Antenor 14, 60, 120, 147, 149, 156, 170–171
- Anticlus 56, 58, 59n39
- Antiochus 9, 14, 15, 17, 54, 55
- anxiety of influence 141
- Aphrodite 41, 45, 58–60, 62–65, 98, 123, 128, 138, 143–144, 238, 261, 275, 288–290, 307, 329, 349, 376–377
- Apollo 1, 12, 36, 38–39, 44, 55, 97, 98, 121, 123, 149, 218, 232, 234, 235, 238–239, 262, 284n79
- Apollonius of Rhodes 2, 32, 73n12, 295, 296–313
- Apollonius of Tyre 144
- apotheosis 44, 241, 243, 254–255, 339, 252
- Apuleianism 299
- Arete, Alcinous' wife 65, 215, 307–309
- Arete, mountain 78, 79
- Argo, ship 295, 297, 300, 312
- Argonautica*
of Apollonius Rhodius 32, 295, 297, 298, 302, 308
of Valerius Flaccus 4, 295–296, 297, 299, 301, 304, 307, 310–311
of Varro Atacinus 295
- Ariadne, saint 60
- Ariadne 93, 304
- Artemis 63, 75, 121n32, 162, 163, 212, 213
- Arthur, king 117, 165
- Ascanius 160, 274, 275, 289, 327, 385, 390, 391
- Ashby, George 142
- Astyanax 13, 41, 60
- Atropos, *see* Fates
- Attila the Hun 171, 172
- Augustus, emperor 44, 45, 229, 230, 232, 238, 241–244, 255, 256, 264, 282n64, 323, 376, 382
- Baebius Italicus 33
- Bakhtin, Mikhail 180, 185, 187, 216
- Bellerophon 40
- Beroaldo, Filippo 299
- Bertochus, Dominus 297
- Boccaccio, Giovanni 134, 142, 144
- Boethius 140, 380
- Bracciolini, Poggio 297, 335
- Brant, Sebastian 289, 290
- Briseis 37, 39–40, 120
- Brutus 161–165, 167, 168, 173
- Butler, Judith 206–208

- Caesar, Julius 241, 242n42, 251, 254–259, 280, 282, 295, 317–332
- Calchas 12, 39, 56, 80, 121n33, 151
- Callimachus, Callimachean 73, 75–76, 231, 239n34, 240, 299
- Calliope, *see* Muses
- Calypso 19, 201, 215, 219
- da Canal, Martin 155, 169–173
- Cassandra 58, 60–61, 66, 149
- Catalogue of Ships 24, 26
- Cato the Elder 43
- Catullus 32n3, 304
- Charles I, king 316, 353
- Charles II, king 333, 337, 339, 340, 353–354
- Charybdis 216, 219
- Chaucer, Geoffrey 3, 134–152, 384
- Chryseis 36, 39
- Chryses 36, 38–40
- Cicero 32, 43, 45, 271, 329
- Circe 15, 201, 208, 215, 216, 218, 219, 254, 310
- Cixous, Hélène 208, 210, 219, 220
- Claudius, emperor 44
- Cleopatra 4, 317–318, 320–332
- Clodius 43
- closure 4, 27, 228–231, 233, 235n25, 241, 243, 244, 245, 252, 290, 296, 317
- Clotho, *see* Fates
- Clytemnestra 58, 149, 211, 215
- Codex Marco* 169
- delle Colonne, Guido 134, 145
- Constantine Manasses 106
- Cupid 138, 143, 145, 148, 149, 327, 329
- Cyanippus 56
- Cyrus of Panopolis 52
- Dante Aligheri 142, 146, 193, 377, 388
- Dardanus, son of Zeus 44, 278n46
- Dares Phrygius 120, 121, 123, 125, 127, 130, 134, 138, 146, 157, 386, 387
- Davenant, William 316
- Deiphobus 59, 104n41
- Demodocus 16, 57, 67, 82
- Descartes, René 178
- Diana, *see* Artemis
- Dictys Cretensis 116, 118, 119–121, 123, 127–128, 134, 157, 386, 387
- Dido 40, 42, 48, 230, 244, 251, 259, 262, 275, 279, 304, 305, 306, 317, 320, 323, 327, 328, 332, 340, 343, 348, 375, 376, 380, 384–385, 390
- digression 123–124, 127, 128, 129, 299
- Diomede / Diomedes 9, 12, 17, 18, 24, 40, 41, 56, 97, 98, 100, 104n41, 121n31, 147, 149, 249, 252, 261
- Dionysius Periegetes 52, 107
- Dioscorus of Aphroditto 52
- The Divine Comedy*, *see* Dante Aligheri
- Domitian, emperor 33, 264
- Donatus Auctus* 376
- Douglas, Gavin 142, 267, 289n97, 290, 358n4, 372
- dreams 12, 42, 62, 66, 100n26, 121, 123, 127, 128, 136, 143, 162, 209, 217, 221, 268–271, 375, 384
- Dudo of San Quentin 155–169, 172
- ecphrasis/ekphrasis* 42, 56, 78, 83n60, 381, 382
- Ennius 31, 124, 229n9, 242, 248–249, 253, 257, 259, 262, 268
- Epeius 55, 57, 99
- Epic cycle 9, 101n0, 47, 48, 73, 81, 227–233, 235, 245
- Aethiopsis* 17n38, 21n54, 81, 235n25
- Cypria* 9, 14n27, 61, 81
- Iliad(s)* 1–3, 9–11, 13–27, 31, 32–35, 38, 43, 46, 47, 49, 53–59, 61–67, 71, 74, 75, 77–83, 92–93, 98–101, 104, 108–109, 119–120, 159, 198, 228, 230, 231–236, 249, 359, 363, 365, 382, 386, 390
- Little Iliad* 4, 9, 228
- Odyssey* 1–3, 9–11, 15, 18–19, 20–27, 31, 32, 53, 55, 62, 64, 71, 82, 93, 106, 175, 177, 189, 193, 200, 206, 211, 213, 221, 230, 236, 249, 295, 365, 383
- Returns / Nostoi* 17, 19, 95
- Sack of Troy / Iliupersis* 15, 27, 53, 72, 375
- Telegony* 9, 15n28
- Epicurus 48
- epithet(s) 35, 38–39, 72, 73, 142, 151, 192–193, 236
- epyllia 53, 72, 297
- Eris 62–63
- Euripides 86n68, 104, 141, 295
- Eurycleia 206, 210, 211, 216–218
- Eustathios 90n2, 102n35

- Fates 44–45, 99, 208, 248, 262, 331, 340
 Fulgentius 299, 377
 future reflexive 250
- gender 152, 206–210, 213, 214, 219, 221, 389, 390
 Genette, Gérard 135, 137–141
 Geoffrey of Monmouth 155, 159, 164n48
 George of Pisidy 52
 ghosts 118, 206, 235, 238, 248, 249, 251, 252, 253, 257, 258, 262, 312, 322, 350, 351
 Glaukos 40–41
 Gower, John 142–144
- Hamilton of Gilbertfield, William 357, 360
 Hannibal 259, 261, 329, 335–354
 harmony of spheres 45–46
 Harvard School 49n58
 Hector 11–13, 15, 16, 19, 34, 38, 41–42, 46–49, 55, 59, 71, 74, 81, 97, 100, 104, 120, 124, 127, 129, 147, 228, 232–234, 248, 252, 257
 Hecuba 22, 60, 100n26, 124, 128
 Helen 14, 15, 18, 22, 38, 56, 58–67, 99, 100, 103–104, 115, 119, 126, 127–128, 193–195, 201, 206, 208–219, 321, 389
 Helenus 55, 100, 104n41
 Helladius 52
 Hellenism 53n5, 90, 200
 Hera 11, 13, 60, 62–64, 97, 229, 250, 252, 254, 259–261, 274, 339–340, 349
 Hercules 32n6, 201, 255, 299, 330, 352
 Hermes 63, 215
 Hermione 62, 66
 Hephaistos 42, 158
 Hölderlin, Friedrich 203
 Homer, *see* epic cycle
Hoplon krisis 71, 83
 Horace 36, 124, 227–231, 241–244, 263, 300, 311n43
 hypotext 138, 227, 230–238, 245
- Iceland 154, 164
 Idomeneus 17, 25–26, 120, 186, 195, 386
Iliad, *see* epic cycle
 immanent literary history 249
 incompleteness 13, 296
 intertextuality 135, 141
 Iris 261
- Jason 119, 295–297, 301–313
 Jerome, saint 140–141, 270–271, 285, 287
 John of Gaza 52
 Jonson, Ben 316
 Jove, *see* Jupiter
 Julio-Claudian Dynasty 32, 44, 49, 256, 264
 Juno, *see* Hera
 Jupiter 11, 35, 41, 44, 46, 54, 58–60, 63–64, 77, 97, 128, 158, 214, 241, 244, 251–255, 259–260, 273, 282, 288–290, 331, 339
- kerostasia* 59
 Kinaston, Sir Francis 137–138
 Kristeva, Julia 135, 141
- Lachesis, *see* Fates
 Laertes 26, 215
 Laocoön 385
 Laodice 60
 Lavinia 160, 250, 273, 275, 277, 289, 378–391
 Leibniz 178
Little Iliad, *see* epic cycle
 Livius Andronicus 31
 Livy 34, 278n44, 329, 335, 339, 349n33
 Lucan, *Bellum Civile* 249, 251, 255–259, 263, 316–332, 336
 Lucretius, *de Rerum Natura* 237, 239, 248, 299
 Lycophron 91
 Lydgate, *Troy Book* 134–136, 142, 144–149, 151–152
- Macaulay 336
 Macrobius 136
 Malebranche 178
 Mark Antony 320, 322, 330, 332
 Matilda, Empress 159
 May, Thomas 316–333, 336
 Medea 295–313
 Memnon 9, 15, 20, 55, 71, 81, 100, 101, 104
 memory 17, 27, 43, 48, 91, 105, 200, 360, 382
 Menelaus 11, 14, 16–19, 22, 24, 56–59, 66, 97, 194, 363
 Merlin 165
 Mesomedes 52
 mesostich 33, 44
 metempsychosis 249
 Milton, John 317, 336, 359, 367
 modernism 192n10

- Moirai, *see* Fates
 Monro's Law 15
 Muse(s) 33, 35, 44, 53, 62, 72–75, 95, 98, 101–102, 115, 140, 248, 363
 Calliope 53, 54, 95, 99, 115, 318
 myth, general 52, 62, 73, 80, 83, 92, 96–98, 102–107, 123, 161, 172, 192, 195–204, 206–209, 212, 231, 249, 252, 255

 Naevius 31
 nationalism 196–199, 202, 369–371
 Nausicaa 201, 215, 219
 Neoptolemus 15, 17, 19–20, 56, 59, 100
 Neoterics 32
 Nero, emperor 32–33, 43–49, 256, 318
 Nestor 14–18, 23–25, 80–83, 104, 232, 234–236, 245
 Nestor of Laranda 53, 67n83
 Niccoli, Niccolò 297
 Nietzsche, Friedrich 200, 202
 Ninnius Crassus 31
 Niobe 80, 83–85
 Nonnus 52, 62n64, 66n77, 73, 86
 Normans 154–160

 Odin 164–168
 Odysseus 9, 12, 15–27, 39, 43, 47, 56–59, 64–65, 77, 82, 100, 103, 189–203, 206–221, 237
Odyssey, *see* epic cycle
 Olympiodorus of Thebes 52
 Ovid 32, 37–38, 42, 115, 123, 227, 251, 347
 Fasti 227
 Heroides 115, 227, 230, 233, 241, 295, 304, 385, 387
 Metamorphoses 136, 227–245, 250, 253, 265–267, 275, 280, 282, 288
Ovide moralisé 280–282

 Padua 171
 Palladas 52
 Pamprepius of Panopolis 52
 Pandrasus 161
 Paratextuality 137
 Parcae, *see* Fates
 Paris 12, 14, 22, 38, 56, 61–67, 71, 97, 99–100, 115, 120, 124, 126, 128, 215, 233, 260
 da Parma, Basinio 298n13
 Patroclus 14–15, 17, 24, 46, 54, 100

 Paul the Silentiary 52
 peace 46, 78, 157, 168, 173, 213, 259, 273–277, 288, 379
 Peleus 46, 62, 74, 150
 Pelias 296, 309
 Penelope 23, 25, 27, 66, 189, 193, 206–221, 387
 Penthesilea 48
 de Perceval, Caussin 300n20
Periochae 35
 Petrarch 142
 Pharsalus 251, 255, 256, 258
 Phereclus 56, 65
pieris 33, 44
 Pindar 82n49, 197, 295
 Pisander of Laranda 52, 72
 Planudes, Maximus 108
 Plato 82, 329
 Plotinus 61
 Polyxena 60, 100, 120
 Poseidon 11, 55, 60, 158, 221, 263
Posthomeric 52, 71–87
 Potifar 41n34
 Priam 12–14, 46–48, 58–60, 85, 99, 120, 124, 128, 161, 165, 167, 227, 233, 390
 Proclus 95n16
 Proitos 41n34
 prophecy 11–13, 19, 26, 80, 157–163, 166, 172, 237, 241, 243, 255, 257, 259–264, 348, 351, 370, 385
 psychostasia 59

 Quintus of Smyrna, *see* *Posthomeric*

 rationalists 178–180, 185
 reinvention 251n10, 253–254
 Rhesus 54, 55
 Ritsos, Yannis 203
 Robert of Gloucester 159
 Rollo 155, 157–161, 173
 Romanos the Melode 52
 Romanticism 203
 Ronsard 177
 Rousseau 175–176
 Rufinus 52
 Rugerius, Ugo 297

 Sarpedon 54, 55, 99, 100
 satire 125–126
 Saturn 46, 122, 138, 143

- Scaeva 318–319
 Scipio 248, 262–264, 329, 335, 339, 349, 351, 354
 Scylla 216, 218, 254
 Seferis, George 203
 Seneca 329
 Senecan Tragedy 33, 39
 Shakespeare, William 151, 323, 330, 336
 Sibyl 165, 232, 236–242, 245, 249, 383
 Sigtuna 168
 Silius Italicus 248–255, 259–263, 329, 335–354
 similes 10, 56, 59, 60, 63, 86, 101, 243, 283–285, 311–313, 328, 330, 332
 Simoeis 60
 Sinon 57–59
 Sirens 215–216, 219, 221
 Snorri Sturluson 155, 164–169
Somnium Scipionis 45
 Sophocles 197
 Soterichus Oasites 52
 Spengler, Oswald 197
 Spinoza 178
 Statius 123, 125, 335
 Stephen, king 159
 Stesichorus 104
 Strato 52
 Sulpitius 319

 Telemachus 15–19, 22, 23, 27, 65, 186, 189, 193–194, 206, 209–212, 215, 217
 teleology 237, 255
 Thames 163
Thebaid 125, 227, 363
 Thersites 43, 105n49
 Theano 60
 Thecla, saint 60n55

 Theocritus 64, 231, 239
 Thetis 21, 42, 58, 62, 67, 80–81, 103, 128, 231, 382
 Thoas 25, 310
 Tiber 160, 274, 286n88, 345, 383, 389
 tragedy 33, 53, 125, 140–141, 148, 151, 295
 translation theory 300
 transtextuality 135, 140
 Trojan horse 16, 54–56, 61, 120, 208, 385
 Trojan war 9, 14, 19, 27, 36, 47, 54, 63, 71, 92, 98–105, 115, 121, 126–127, 134, 146, 157, 160–161, 167, 193, 206, 211, 215, 232–235, 252, 386
 Turnus 163, 228, 232, 249, 251, 272, 274–275, 290, 296, 353, 376–381, 388–390

 Ulixes, *see* Odysseus

 Varro 31
Vellus Aureum 296–298
 Venice 169–173
 Venus, *see* Aphrodite
 Vespasian 295
 virtue 21, 144, 152, 177, 179, 181–184, 187, 203, 259, 272n17, 275, 278, 282, 286, 307, 332, 376, 390
 Volusius 32
 Vulcan, *see* Hephaistos

 Weil, Simone 198–199
 Wilkie, William 362–367, 372
 Epigoniad 357–359, 363–367

 Xanthus, river 61

 Zeus, *see* Jupiter